



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-086
Thursday
3 May 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-086

CONTENTS

3 May 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Envoy Grinevskiy on Obstacles to Vienna Progress [IZVESTIYA 2 May]	1
Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Reported [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Apr]	1
'Generals for Peace, Disarmament' Meet [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 May]	2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

USSR, PRC Defense Cuts Model for Asia [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Apr]	3
La Lumiere Urges Better Relations With E. Europe [TASS]	4
CSFR Minister, Envoys Discuss European Security [TASS]	5
Chernobyl Press Conference Held at UN [TASS]	5
Woerner Against Total Elimination of Weapons [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 May]	5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Scheduled To Meet With Prunskiene 3 May [Moscow Radio]	6
Prunskiene Previews Bush Meeting [Vilnius International]	6
Baker on Lithuania, Fitzwater on Prunskiene [PRAVDA 3 May]	6
Solton Offers Commentary on Prospects for Summit [Moscow International]	6
U.S. Air Force Prepares European Missile Bases [TASS]	7
U.S., USSR Near Embassy Building Agreement [TASS]	7
U.S.-Soviet Joint Study of Planet Mars Urged [TASS]	8
Emphasis in Russian Classes Changes in U.S. [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 May]	8

China

Taiwan Lifts Visa Ban for USSR Businessmen [PRAVDA 29 Apr]	8
Chinese Paper Cited on Surge in CPC Recruitment [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	9
Soviet, Chinese Scholars View Bilateral Trade [Moscow International]	9

Northeast Asia

DPRK SPA Session To Be Convened 24 May [Pyongyang Radio]	9
DPRK Military Attache Views Military Ties [Moscow International]	10
New DPRK Ambassador Presents Credentials [Moscow International]	11
Events on USSR-DPRK Cooperation Reported [Moscow International]	11
Scholars' Ties With DPRK, ROK Reported [Moscow International]	12
Soviet-ROK Cooperation in Development Viewed [Moscow International]	12
Gorbachev-Li Peng Talks, Ties With PRC Eyed [Moscow International]	13
Television Reports Demonstration in Ulaanbaatar [Moscow TV]	13
TASS Reports on Demonstrations	14
Mongolian Trade Union Platform Published [TASS]	14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Deputy Premier Phong Interviewed on USSR Visit [Moscow International]	15
---	----

Near East & South Asia

Algerian Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	16
Najibullah Sends Message of Thanks to Gorbachev [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	16

Gorbachev Congratulates India's Gupta on Election	[PRAVDA 30 Apr]	16
Background to Disturbances in Kashmir Surveyed	[PRAVDA 1 May]	16
House Resolution Recognizing Jerusalem Criticized	[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 Apr]	17
King Fahd Sends Koran to Soviet Muslims	[Moscow Radio]	18

Sub-Saharan Africa

'New Soviet Attitude' Toward Africa Viewed	[Moscow International]	18
Borisov Comments on Tanzania Union, Lithuania	[Moscow International]	18

East Europe

United Germany in NATO Called 'Negative'	[PRAVDA 3 May]	19
Hungary Proclaims 1956 Events 'Revolution'	[TASS]	20
Croatian Democrats Aim at 'National Isolation'	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Apr]	20
Kondrashov on East Europe, Waning Soviet Power	[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]	21
East Bloc Refuses To Supply Currency for Rubles	[PRAVDA 30 Apr]	24
Economic Expert Queried on CEMA Transformation	[Budapest Radio]	25

West Europe

Yeltsin Continues Convalescence in Barcelona		26
Recovers After Spinal Disc Surgery	[Madrid Radio]	26
Cited on 'Future President' Role	[AFP]	26
Comments on Anti-Gorbachev Protest	[Madrid Radio]	26
Yeltsin Calls Lithuanian Blockade 'Gross' Mistake	[Madrid Radio]	26
Yeltsin Repeats Call for 'Radical Measures'	[London DAILY TELEGRAPH 28 Apr]	26
Yeltsin Grants Television Interview in London	[London TV]	27
British-Soviet Friendship Society Convenes	[PRAVDA 2 May]	28
Soviet 'Circles' on Alignment of United Germany	[TASS]	29
Petrovskiy Meets WEU Secretary General	[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	29

Latin America & Caribbean

'Encouraging Signs' in Central America Noted		29
[Col. Lutskevich in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Apr]		29
Baklanov Leads Delegation to Cuba	[Moscow Radio]	30
Reportage on Cuba's Rosales Visit to USSR		30
Meets With Moiseyev	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Apr]	30
Visits Tank Unit; Departs	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Apr]	30
Cuba's 'Alarming Situation' Examined	[Moscow Radio]	30
Cuban Troops Continue Withdrawal From Angola	[TASS]	30
Cuban Military Defense Exercises Reported	[TASS]	31
Transfer of Power in Nicaragua Viewed	[IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]	31
Contras 'Demand' Ortega Resignation	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May]	32
People's Deputies Delegation Arrives in Barbados	[TASS]	32
Soviet Parliamentary Delegation Visits Jamaica	[TASS]	33

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Velikhov Outlines Scientific Work at Chernobyl	[Moscow TV]	34
Supreme Soviet Hears Report on Chernobyl	[Moscow TV]	34

Political & Social

Further Reportage on May Day Celebration		37
Leaders 'Forced' To Leave Square	[Moscow International]	37
Traditional, Alternate Events Held	[IZVESTIYA 2 May]	37
Cities' May Day Events Reported	[PRAVDA 2 May]	38
More on Organizing Rally	[TASS]	40
Academies Hold Meeting To Mark Lenin Anniversary	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Apr]	41
Maslennikov Briefs on Gorbachev Trip, Baltics	[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]	41

Gorbachev May Have 'Lost His Way' [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	41
Democratic Platform Stance Defended [MOSCOW NEWS No 16]	43
Details of Draft Defense Law Discussed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Apr]	45
Report From Lubyanka on KGB's 'New Face' [London TV]	47
KGB Official Notes Easing of Border Regime [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Apr]	48
Developments 'Reminiscent' of Germany in 30's [NEW TIMES No 16]	48
Deputy Lopatin's Expulsion From CPSU Examined [Moscow Radio]	49
Academy of Sciences Vice Presidents Elected [PRAVDA 26 Apr]	50
Liberal Democrats Support Unity [TASS]	51
Foreign Reviews of Yeltsin Book Quoted [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]	51
National-International Security Fund Formed [TASS]	53
Economic, Social Reform Fund Created in Moscow [Moscow Radio]	53
Preschool Institution Workers Plan Strike [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]	53
Hospital Patients Publish Strike Demands [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 16]	54
Soviet Germans Protest Anti-German Campaign [Moscow International]	54
Ban on 'Personalized' Media Ownership Backed [PRAVDA 26 Apr]	54
'April' Written Group Ends Constituent Congress [TASS]	55
Cooperative Ventures Stir Social Tension [TASS]	55
Solzhnitsyn Royalties Slated for Monastery [IZVESTIYA 1 May]	55
Correction to Part Two of Yakovlev Interview	56

Economic

Market Economy 'Essential' for European Integration [IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]	57
--	----

Agricultural

Peasant Union Should 'Control' Farming Sector [IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]	59
Orel Reduces Beet Area; 'Big' Harvest Expected [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Apr]	59

Scientific

Academician Criticizes Radiation Hazard Guidelines [TASS]	60
Chernobyl 24-Hour Telethon; Ryzhkov Message [Moscow TV]	60

Military

Lizichev at Writers Meeting To Mark WWII Victory [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Apr]	61
Radiation Safety of Murmansk Fleet Satisfactory [Moscow Radio]	61
Problems of Tu-160 Program Surveyed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May]	61

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Asks France, FRG To Mediate [AFP]	67
Cables Mitterrand, Kohl [Vilnius International]	67
Vilnius To Consider Suspension of Decisions [AFP]	67
Landsbergis' Remarks on West's Reactions [Vilnius International]	67
Supreme Council Examines Court Posts [Vilnius Radio]	68
Vilnius Radio Carries 2 May Council Session	68
Antiblockade Measures Discussed	69
Independence Plan Proposed	69
Greetings to Latvia Read	69
Law Restores Resistance Fighters' Rights [Vilnius International]	70
Chemical Plants Closed Due to Blockade [Vilnius Radio]	70
Lithuanian Spokesman Views Shortages Impact [Vilnius Radio]	70
Prospects for Oil Production in Lithuania Viewed [Vilnius Radio]	70
Report on Developments in Lithuanian Media [Moscow TV]	71
Moscow's Stance Toward Lithuania Viewed [Moscow International]	71
Vilnius Radio Views Military Draft Issues	72
Lithuanian Unemployment, Sugar Shortage Tallied [Vilnius International]	72
Further Reportage on Lithuanian Drivers' Strike [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	72

Estonian Independence Letter to Gorbachev [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 13 Apr]	73
'Panic Buying of Gasoline' Reported in Estonia [Vilnius Radio]	74
Restrictions on Estonian Timber Exports [Vilnius Radio]	74
Riga Radio Carries 3 May Latvian Supreme Soviet	75
Landsbergis Visits	75
Mandates Discussed	75
Latvian Parliament Opens Session on Independence [AFP]	76
Latvia Resolution Predicted To Be 'Radical' [AFP]	77
Latvian Congress Issues Appeal to World [Riga Radio]	77
TASS Reports on Latvian Parliament Issues [TASS]	78
Landsbergis To Attend Latvian Supreme Soviet [Vilnius Radio]	79
Factions in Latvian People's Deputies Reported [Moscow Radio]	79
Factions Outlined [Moscow Radio]	79
Latvian Party Criticizes Separatist Forces [Moscow Radio]	79
Increase in Militia Reported in Riga [Vilnius Radio]	80
29 Latvian Farmers' Union Candidates Elected [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 27 Mar]	80
Analysis of Split in Baltic Communist Parties [NEW TIMES No 16]	80
Latvian Doctors Express Support for Lithuania [Riga International]	81

RSFSR

Goals of 'Neo-Stalinist' Russian Party Criticized [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 17]	82
Stroyev Visits Bashkir; Discusses Economy [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	83
Bashkir Oblast Party Conference Reported [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Apr]	83
Report on Destruction of Krasnodar Kray Hurricane [IZVESTIYA 1 May]	85
Krasnodar Kray Soviet Chairman Interviewed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Apr]	85
Government Commission Reports on Ufa Contamination [Moscow TV]	89
Goals of New Orthodox Monarchist Party Outlined [ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 16]	89
Comparison: Gorbachev Nizhni Tagil Speech [PRAVDA 29 Apr]	90

Western Republics

Decree Issued to Aid Chernobyl Victims [PRAVDA 7 Apr]	92
Resettlement of Crimean-Tatars Examined [PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Mar]	93
Donetsk Oblast Political Turmoil Viewed [TRUD 25 Apr]	93

Caucasus

Armenian Party Chief on Solution to Crisis [TASS]	96
Racial Incitement Added to Criminal Code [IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]	96
Moscow Weekly Accused of Bias on Baku Events [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Apr]	97
Baku Leaders Attend Lenin Birthday Ceremony [Baku Radio]	99
Gumbaridze Meets With KGB, Ministry Officials [ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Mar]	99
Gumbaridze Speaks on Current Issues [ZARYA VOSTOKA 25 Mar]	101
Future of Georgian Komsomol Discussed [ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Mar]	103
Goals of Georgian 'National Accord' Discussed [ZARYA VOSTOKA 25 Mar]	103

Central Asia

Conference Decides To Replace Party Officials [IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]	105
Ministry of Health Notes AIDS Figures [SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 20 Apr]	105
Kirghiz Chairman Interviewed on Unity [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 May]	105
Ministry Halts Nuclear Testing in Kazakhstan [Belgrade TANJUG]	107

Envoy Grinevskiy on Obstacles to Vienna Progress

PM0205110190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 May 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent S. Tosunyan report under "East-West" rubric: "Why the Talks Are at a Standstill"]

[Text] Vienna—The sixth round of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces and the talks on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe are drawing to a close.

A year ago, when these talks began, hardly anyone expected them to be easy: After all, there was a host of the most complex problems to resolve. In addition, during the year events happened which changed the situation on the European Continent. The changes taking place offer unique opportunities to heal the split and create new security structures in Europe, but at the same time they introduce elements of instability and set the delegations from the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO countries the most complex problems. How are these problems being resolved at the talks? O. Grinevskiy, leader of the Soviet delegation and special envoy, now describes that process:

No matter how complex the problems posed by the talks, the delegations of the 23 countries have managed to maintain an atmosphere of constructive cooperation and seek mutually acceptable solutions together. As a result a considerable distance has been covered and the outline of a future treaty is becoming increasingly visible, acquiring more and more sets of concrete accords and agreed texts day by day. I hope that the final stage of our talks will be held in the same atmosphere.

I would characterize the round that has just finished as an intensive search for solutions across the whole range of technical questions forming the groundwork outline of a future treaty. As a result progress has already been achieved in agreeing the definitions of tanks and armored vehicles. Much work has been done on questions of information exchange and verification. The participants in the talks are now close to completing the agreement of a number of crucial sections of the treaty.

For the first time there was an objective discussion of the problem of destroying the arms and equipment limited by the treaty. The Soviet delegation submitted its draft procedure on the protocols regulating the process of rendering conventional arms unfit for combat use and destroying or converting them. There was also agreement on five articles, some definitions, and almost all the preamble to the future treaty.

At the same time there has been a deceleration in the pace of the talks. There is serious concern at the fact that, despite the accord reached by the foreign ministers in Ottawa on the reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops in Europe, the talks failed to begin the elaboration of an accord on personnel. On a number of occasions the

Soviet delegation proposed beginning this work. This proposal has still not been answered by our Western partners.

Some delegations are losing interest in the search for a solution to aviation problems. We proposed an alternative option which would remove many difficulties: to establish equal levels for U.S. and USSR warplanes outside their national territories in Europe, for example, of 500 planes each. So far it remains unanswered.

The leaders of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries unambiguously advocate the acceleration of dialogue, and the heads of the foreign policy departments themselves have been coming to Vienna to take part personally in our discussions. At the same time you get the impression that when it comes down to actual work the impetus from above somehow disappears at the level of experts.

Take the problem of tanks, for example. The political significance of the radical reductions is clear, especially in the current situation in Europe. We have expressed a readiness to cut 40,000 tanks. You would think that the West, which has spoken about the "tank threat from the East" for decades, would jump at the chance of concluding such an agreement. However, it is dragging its feet as before, introducing more and more new definitions. The experts, diverted by trifling disputes, are losing sight of the political perspective and setting a series of obstacles on the path to an agreement in which the West should be no less interested than we ourselves are. The situation is the same with armored combat vehicles.

The participants in the Vienna talks, the Soviet delegation head said in conclusion, have been given a tremendous responsibility: To do everything possible to ensure that the political will of our countries' leaders is embodied in concrete deeds. The Soviet delegation is fully aware of the moral responsibility and intends to follow unswervingly the course toward the successful conclusion of the talks on schedule.

Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Reported

PM0105092390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Latest Round"]

[Text] Geneva, 26 Apr—The latest round of the Soviet-U.S. bilateral consultations on banning chemical weapons taking place within the framework of the disarmament conference has ended here. In accordance with the instruction of the leaders of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments elaborated at their Washington meeting 4-6 April this year, the delegations focused special attention on the completion of preparation of a bilateral agreement on the mutual commitments which the USSR and the United States should adopt until an all-embracing international convention on banning chemical weapons enters into force. They

include the destruction of a considerable proportion of the stocks of these weapons accumulated by the two countries in order to reduce them to equal low levels. As the concluding joint statement notes, the progress achieved during the present round and the delegations' mutual desire to seek mutually acceptable solutions make it possible to hope for the completion of work on the agreement in the very near future.

'Generals for Peace, Disarmament' Meet

PM0205145990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Captain S. Sidorov report: "Movement Must Be United"]

[Text] "It is time to stop talking of 'East' and 'West' Europe—the continent is becoming increasingly united. Therefore our movement too must be united," British Brigadier General Michael Harbottle, retired, one of the founders of the "Generals for Peace and Disarmament" movement, said. He and his colleagues of the "Soviet Generals and Admirals for Peace and Disarmament" group met with journalists at the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace.

The movement, which has received broad public recognition, began its activity in 1981, when several high-ranking former servicemen from NATO countries united in a nongovernmental group for the purpose of promoting the task of eliminating the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Since 1984 they have maintained regular business contacts with the retired Soviet generals and admirals who have set up their own public group.

"During this visit to the Soviet Union," Harbottle pointed out, "an agreement has been reached to hold a new meeting in November-December. There we will discuss the immediate tasks in view of the structural changes to the concept of European security, as well as our general role in the light of the radical changes on the European Continent. Henceforth we would like to meet not as representatives of different military-political unions but as members of a single organ."

"The question of increasing the movement's influence and extending it to other regions is on its agenda today," Major General Rair Simonyan, retired, member of the Soviet group, said. "A start has been made on preparations to hold a worldwide conference of the 'Generals for Peace and Disarmament' movement next year. Former high-ranking servicemen from various continents will be invited to the forum, within whose framework it is planned to discuss global aspects of security."

Replying to a question about what can already be credited to the movement, the participants in the meeting at the Soviet Peace Committee agreed that the chief result of the six-year cooperation between Soviet and West European retired generals is a common understanding of questions of European and global security.

"Whereas in 1984," Simonyan pointed out, "we treated each other with a certain cautiousness, as though studying each other, now all efforts are aimed at seeking the optimum solutions."

As Harbottle emphasized, there are grounds for speaking of the definite impact of the movement's activity on the thinking of politicians on an official level. The ideas that were being discussed at the movement's conferences three years ago, he said, are today becoming elements of government policy in a number of countries.

USSR, PRC Defense Cuts Model for Asia

PM0205103190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Own observer Aleksandr Golts article under rubric "The World Today: Problems and Views": "Opening up the Future"]

[Text] The reports about Soviet-U.S. relations, problems pertaining to the unification of Germany, and the situation in Lithuania, which have been filling the pages of the world press of late, had to make room for another topic this week. To provide space for information on the visit to the USSR of Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and chairman of the PRC State Council. And this event merited it. True to the principle proclaimed during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Beijing last year—"To close the past and open up the future"—the two countries have achieved more over the past 11 months than during recent decades.

If during the talks in Beijing relations between the USSR and the PRC were normalized, then during the recent days in Moscow the main avenues of cooperation were outlined. Of particular significance is the long-term program for economic, scientific and technical cooperation. This document defines collaboration between the two states for the next decade and provides the basis for the development of intensive, mutually advantageous relations in various national economic spheres.

No less important is another document—the agreement between the two countries' governments on the guiding principles of mutual force reductions and confidence building in the military sphere in the Soviet-Chinese border region. It seems to me that its significance by far exceeds the framework of bilateral relations. After all, this is essentially a step which marks an innovation in interstate relations in Asia. Until now relations between the continent's states in the military sphere were conducted either on the basis of confrontation or of alliance.

Naturally, there are quite a few similarities in the approaches of the Soviet Union and China to key international problems. And this is very good. Both countries reaffirm that they will never be the first to use nuclear weapons; both are unilaterally reducing their armed forces. The USSR and the PRC favor nonuse of force in international relations, the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories, and the elimination of bases outside national borders. The talks between the Soviet and the Chinese foreign ministers revealed that positions are drawing closer even on the controversial topic of regional conflicts.

All this is true. However, I would also like to draw attention to the fact that the document on the principles of mutual force reductions and confidence building in the region of the common border has been signed at a time when our countries retain differing approaches to a number of problems. And even if there can be no talk of

concluding any kind of an alliance, there nonetheless is evidence of a desire to ensure security in the border area by political rather than military means. I regard this as a very important step. Essentially, China and the Soviet Union are demonstrating how states which do not always share the same views and approaches can and must conduct their affairs in the region.

After all, the military-political situation which is taking shape in the region demands precisely this approach to the problems of Asian security. Four years have now elapsed since the proclamation of the Vladivostok program, and Soviet leaders and our diplomats are still working on breaking down the mutual distrust in the region.

I will not hide the fact that over these years I, like many others too, no doubt, have more than once felt disillusioned. Well-weighed and well-conceived initiatives on the part of the USSR, and measures to reduce and limit its military activity seem to have met with no response at all from the United States and its allies. And only now, it appears, are these initiatives beginning to bear the first, modest results. It is possible to claim today that people in Washington, and also in a number of Asian capitals, are being forced to admit that it is necessary to introduce at least some correctives in military policy.

Evidence of this is the report "Strategic Structure in the Asia-Pacific Region (Strategic Concept in East Asia)" which the administration has sent to Congress. In accordance with this document the Pentagon plans to cut the strength of its military grouping in Asian countries over the next three years as follows: 7,000 officers and men are to be withdrawn from South Korea, 6,000 from Japan, and 2,000 from the Philippines. "Reductions on a moderate scale" are planned for subsequent years.

New words are also beginning to appear in the political vocabulary of official Tokyo. Foreign Minister T. Nakayama has declared Japan's readiness to discuss confidence-building measures in the military sphere with the USSR. According to him, this question could be discussed during the exchange of opinions on arms control and disarmament problems in Japanese islands area during the upcoming talks with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze.

According to the Seoul press, the South Korean Government has drawn up a package of measures to strengthen confidence on the peninsula. In particular, an accord is envisaged between South Korea and the DPRK on mutual notification of large-scale troop movements and military exercises, the invitation of observers from the other side, the withdrawal of offensive weapons from areas bordering on the demilitarized zone, and a substantial force reduction in the same areas.

As we can see, so far it is a question of promises and intentions which have not yet been backed up by concrete actions. But that is understandable. The approach of the United States and its allies to problems of Asian security is still highly contradictory. Washington, while

promising to carry out some troop cuts, is rejecting an important Soviet initiative: To open talks on possible measures to limit military activity in Asia and the Pacific. The U.S. military never tire of declaring that they intend to pursue their forward basing strategy for which, you see, they need outposts in Asia. And insofar as our country is now reducing its grouping in Asia by 200,000 servicemen and very few people lend credence to references to the "Soviet military threat," there is a great rush to invent other pretexts. Military leaders are making vague statements alleging that if U.S. troops are withdrawn, a kind of a "strategic vacuum" will form which some kind of "hostile forces" will seek to exploit.

At the same time the Pentagon does not bother much even with elementary logic. Some people declare that the proposed reductions of U.S. troops will be possible only if the Japanese and South Korean forces assume the functions which are currently being carried out by the Americans. Others go even further by solicitously trying to persuade the Asian states that U.S. troops must remain in order to contain...Japan's expansionism. The selfsame Japan whose buildup of military preparations did not take place without U.S. support—a process that is still continuing. An analogy suggests itself here: the desire to include a united Germany in NATO on the fabricated pretext that in this way it will supposedly be possible "to keep an eye on it."

As for Japan itself and its proclaimed readiness to discuss possible confidence-building measures, Tokyo has stated in the same breath through the mouth of Prime Minister Kaifu that there can be no talk of any cuts in military programs. Japan, he declared to parliament, must be ready to repulse "a limited act of aggression." While Y. Ishikawa, director of the National Defense Agency, went even further, developing the thesis of the "Soviet threat."

Not all is well either as regards South Korea. The planned confidence-building measures announced by Seoul do not tie up in the least with the dispatch of Korean ships to take part, jointly with the United States, Japan, Australia, and Canada, in the major "Rimpac-90" exercises.

Consequently, there are quite a few contradictions in the positions of the United States and its allies. Clearly, the point is that the military confrontation which has persisted for decades has become for many such a completely natural component of Asian policy that they simply cannot conceive it any other way. It is like an old pair of slippers. The owner sees that he should throw them away but he cannot bear to part with them—his feet are so used to them. New ones are bound to pinch....

An analysis of U.S. policy in the Asia-Pacific region shows that even in conditions of its weakening economic positions there it is seeking to retain its leading role. And in the opinion of U.S. strategists, the simplest way to achieve this is to retain supremacy in the military sphere.

And the reason why Tokyo cannot abandon confrontation has been candidly explained by the newspaper ASAHI. You have to bear in mind, it warned, the possibility that the winds of detente sweeping around the world will not only not have a beneficial impact on Japan but may, on the contrary, become a hurricane as far as Japan is concerned. Because there is a great likelihood that, as claims about the "Soviet military threat" wane, fears of a "Japanese economic threat" will intensify throughout the world. And not just an economic threat. Tokyo is seeking to bolster its economic strength with the corresponding military strength.

This is why it is so important in the current contradictory atmosphere that the USSR and China have signed the agreement on reducing armed forces and on confidence-building measures in the military sphere in the border region. In this way, setting an example worthy of emulation, they have demonstrated mutual interest in the gradual establishment of a broader system of mutual relations which would render the use of force meaningless. In this way they have acted as pioneers in the region.

La Lumiere Urges Better Relations With E. Europe

*LD0205213590 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT
2 May 90*

[Text] Vienna May 3 TASS—The process of mutually beneficial cooperation and rapprochement between the Council of Europe and East European countries continues to develop successfully. The Soviet Union, Hungary and Poland have been followed by Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic seeking after closer contacts. Secretary-General of the Council of Europe Catherine la Lumiere told a news conference here on Wednesday on the occasion of her official visit to Austria.

She stressed the Council's interest in expanding constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union, the beginning to which was set during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France.

The search for new ways and forms of cooperation is facilitated by regular contacts with Soviet parliamentarians who participated in the Council work as observers, she pointed out.

Speaking about large-scale transformations in East European countries, La Lumiere noted that much has yet to be done in a number of states to make these processes irreversible and ensure true political pluralism.

The issue of refugees was recalled by the secretary-general of the Council of Europe as one of the most acute problems facing the European public today. She supported the idea put forth by Austrian Foreign Minister Alois Mock concerning the convocations of an international conference at the level of members of governments to work out a legally substantiated and fair solution of the issue in the spirit of humanness and respect for a

comprehensive balance of interests. She said such a conference might be held early next year.

CSFR Minister, Envoys Discuss European Security

*LD0305082190 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT
3 May 90*

[Text] Prague May 3 TASS—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier met envoys from countries participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Albanian envoy to Czechoslovakia here on Wednesday to discuss Czechoslovakia's initiative to form a European commission on security.

Commenting on the outcome of the meeting, Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry spokesman Lobos Dobrowskij said the sides had in-depth talks on the speed of creating new European security structures, the role of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty role in Europe and Czechoslovakia's initiative to boost the process of European disarmament.

Security should be based on harmony between current military-political pacts, European institutions and the results of the Helsinki meeting, he said.

Discussions between European states should help implement the Czechoslovak proposal, he said, calling for the setting up of a group of international experts to analyse aspects of creating the European commission on security.

President Vaclav Havel will explain the proposal in more depth during his visit to Strasbourg on May 10, the spokesman said.

Ideally, the commission could be set up this year, he said.

Chernobyl Press Conference Held at UN

*LD0205220290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1930 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] United Nations, 2 May (TASS)—The consequences of Chernobyl constitute a disaster for all mankind, and their elimination requires the pooling of the efforts of the community of nations. This idea was the leitmotiv of a press conference that took place on Wednesday in the United Nations New York headquarters in connection with the fourth anniversary of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES].

Gennadiy Udovenko, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic's [SSR] permanent representative at the United Nations, drew journalists' attention to the fact that the governments of the Soviet Union, the Belorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR had, for the first time, proposed the inclusion of an extra item, "International cooperation in eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station," on the agenda of the session of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which has opened here.

Replying to journalists' questions, the Ukrainian representative talked about the vast resources that are being allocated to the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people from the zones that have been contaminated by radionuclides. New instances were presented, brought to light as a result of constant major studies, which indicate that there has been an underestimate not only of the scale of the accident's consequences at national levels, but also of the very phenomenon of Chernobyl, including its international aspects.

Yuriy Shcherbak, a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Ukrainian ecological association "Zeley Svit" ("Green World"), who spoke at the press conference, described the broad complex of urgent measures that it is possible to implement with the participation of the governments and public organizations of the UN member countries.

Woerner Against Total Elimination of Weapons

*PM0205105990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 May 90 First Edition p 3*

[TASS report: "Against Elimination"]

[Text] Bonn, 1 May—NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner has come out against the total elimination of nuclear weapons. He declared in an interview in the West German newspaper AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE that some nuclear potential must be preserved in order to prevent war. The Western allies' possible abandonment of the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, M. Woerner emphasized, should not be regarded as a step toward the elimination of nuclear weapons on FRG territory or in Europe.

Describing the role of the NATO bloc under the new conditions, he said that the North Atlantic alliance must not be disbanded.

United States & Canada

Bush Scheduled To Meet With Prunskiene 3 May

LD0305074490 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 0630 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] In Washington today a meeting will take place between U.S. President George Bush and Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania. Our correspondent Sergey Levskoy reports from the United States.

[Levskoy] The first meeting between the U.S. President and a representative of the new Lithuanian leadership will be of a private and unofficial kind. The President's spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said that George Bush believes it important to learn first hand what is happening in Lithuania and to get to know the views of Kazimiera Prunskiene on the situation in the republic. He stressed that the U.S. President will meet her as a private individual and not as prime minister of an independent Lithuania.

The White House statement regarding the private nature of the meeting, American observers believe, demonstrates the U.S. Administration's unwillingness to complicate relations with the Soviet Union. At the same time, the paper THE NEW YORK TIMES, commenting on the meeting, notes that it will cause additional problems for Soviet-American relations, in spite of the desire of the White House to avoid it being perceived as tacit recognition by the United States of Lithuanian independence. Previously, the U.S. Administration has avoided direct contacts with Lithuanian official figures. The U.S. President has not replied to the personal message sent to him by Vytautas Landsbergis, the leader of Lithuania.

Prunskiene Previews Bush Meeting

LD0205223290 Vilnius International Service
in English 2200 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] The Lithuanian prime minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, who has ended her visit to Canada, is to meet with the U.S. President, George Bush, in Washington tomorrow.

In an interview to the Lithuanian service of the Voice of America Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene said she believed that the meeting would not pass without any (?traces) especially in connection with the forthcoming summit between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev.

Kazimiera Prunskiene pointed out that Lithuania's stand in seeking dialogue with Moscow was getting very flexible. I would like to speak about the hopes and belief of the Lithuanian nation, Kazimiera Prunskiene said, that faith has given President Bush and President Gorbachev a special chance to leave beautiful (?traces) in the world history by settling the Lithuanian problem, thus starting a new epoch in Europe.

The Lithuanian prime minister defined her meetings with Canadian businessmen as extremely valuable.

Baker on Lithuania, Fitzwater on Prunskiene

PM0205163690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 May 90 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On a Private Visit"]

[Text] Washington, 2 May—White House spokesman M. Fitzwater announced on Tuesday that U.S. President G. Bush will meet on 3 May with K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, who is coming to Washington on a private visit.

"The President considers it important to hear an authoritative exposition and description of events in Lithuania and to find out about this at first hand. That is why she is coming here," Fitzwater noted. He stressed that the visit is a private one and the President will meet with Prunskiene as a "recognized and freely elected representative of the Lithuanian people," but not as a "representative of free Lithuania." "We do not recognize Lithuania, and nothing has changed in this respect," the White House spokesman stated.

Speaking at hearings in a Senate subcommittee, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker touched on the question of the situation surrounding Lithuania and expressed concern about the "escalation of tension." At the same time he expressed the hope that dialogue would start, noting that in the past week signs have emerged of a quest for "possibilities for compromise," and that the United States would not wish any obstacles to arise in the path of such efforts.

The head of the foreign policy department stressed that Lithuania is "an extremely complex and sensitive issue, and much should be taken into account in resolving it." In particular, he said, "the Lithuania that we recognize as an independent state" is not the same as the Baltic republic that is now a part of the Soviet Union. Its territory today is not the same as prior to its incorporation into the USSR. "Some parts of today's Lithuania were handed over to it from the Soviet Union," the secretary of state pointed out. Therefore the problem requires a "considered solution."

On Tuesday the U.S. Senate adopted by 73 votes to 24 a resolution on Lithuania expressing the Senate's opinion on the problem in question; the resolution is not binding in nature. It calls on the administration not to conclude a trade agreement with the USSR while the "economic blockade" of Lithuania continues.

Solton Offers Commentary on Prospects for Summit

LD0205140290 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] Preparations for the Soviet-American summit coming in late May-early June have entered their final

stage. In mid-May the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will again meet to discuss all the aspects of the coming summit. Diplomats and other experts are actively working to coordinate the draft documents to be signed. Now, can we be sure that they will get them all ready by the time of the summit? An opinion from our news analyst Yuriy Solton, and this is what he writes:

I must admit that I do have certain apprehensions. They concern above all the treaty that we've been expecting for several years. I mean cutting strategic weapons by one half. I won't go into details now, and I have no wish to accuse anyone of delaying tactics, though I must say that the Americans seem to have taken a needlessly rigid stance on the strategic sea and air-based cruise missiles, probably in the hope to keep the present advantage of the United States in this field.

I should say that if the treaty is not at least initialled this time, it will negatively affect the whole disarmament process, and I think that this is clearly seen not only in Moscow but also in Washington.

That was signalled a few days ago by the resignation of President Bush's special adviser on disarmament talks, Edward Rowny. American newspapers pointed out that he would probably delay the talks on strategic weapons.

There is still time to prepare this important treaty and other vital agreements. There are about 10 of them in our bilateral relations, above all on trade, granting the Soviet Union most favored nation status.

Harping on the events in Lithuania, some American legislators have tried to slow down the development of Soviet-American trade and economic ties. Calls have been heard that Mr Bush should apply economic sanctions to Moscow. To his credit, the President did not yield to that pressure.

Late last month, experts of the two countries settled, on the whole, the text of the trade agreement.

Never mind how many agreements will result from the coming Soviet-American summit. We cannot measure its importance by their number alone, though we do expect, of course, that some concrete solutions will emanate from it. But it's equally important that the two presidents will discuss tete-a-tete the situation in Europe and the future of a united Germany, the military conflict in Afghanistan and a settlement for the Middle East, also ecological problems. We do know that their respective approaches to all those issues may differ or even be opposite, but a summit is held precisely for the chance to work out a common approach, meeting the interests of both sides and all those who wish to strengthen international security, concludes our news analyst Yuriy Solton.

U.S. Air Force Prepares European Missile Bases

*LD0305074190 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT
3 May 90*

[Text] London May 3 TASS—The U.S. Air Force has begun preparing British and mainland European bases for the next generation of nuclear weapons—tactical air-to-surface missiles (TASM), the British GUARDIAN newspaper reports today.

They will be mounted on dual-capable aircraft able to reach deep inside the Soviet Union," the newspaper reveals.

The composition and location of NATO's nuclear forces in Europe remains to be decided by the alliance, the newspaper points out.

However, according to documents obtained by the newspaper, it is already known that by the end of next year storage facilities for 389 of the new nuclear weapons should be complete in seven NATO countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany. According to the plans, 128 of the missiles will be deployed in Britain at Lakenheath, Bentwaters and Upper Heyford.

NATO defense ministers who are meeting next week in Calgary, Canada, are expected to decide that the new TASM nuclear missiles, carried on conventional fighter and fighter-bomber aircraft, will replace the short-range lance nuclear missile and some 4,000 nuclear artillery shells.

According to the newspaper, the missiles will have a range of 250 miles. However, with their own range added to the range of the carrying aircraft, they will be able to hit targets on Soviet territory.

During a recent news conference in London, NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner, asked by a TASS correspondent to comment on plans for the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, said he was not aware of any such plans.

U.S., USSR Near Embassy Building Agreement

*LD2904083690 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT
29 Apr 90*

[Text] Washington April 29 TASS—The United States and the Soviet Union are close to an "understanding in principle" on putting into operation the new embassy buildings in the two capitals, THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports today, referring to high-ranking State Department officials.

It notes that, under the understanding, the United States will tear down the unfinished building of its embassy in Moscow and build a new one on its foundation.

According to Ivan Selin, U.S. under-secretary of state for administrative affairs, this will cost 270 million dollars

and take about five and a half years. Sixty-five per cent of the U.S. Embassy building had already been completed.

The United States alleges that the building was crammed with bugs and is unsuitable for work. Construction work was suspended in 1985. The Soviet side rejects these allegations and levels counter-accusations at Washington.

A news conference was held at the finished building of the new Soviet Embassy two years ago, during which journalists were shown bugs extracted from walls, ceilings and other places.

The U.S. side did not produce similar evidence.

Under the inter-governmental understanding, the Soviet and U.S. Embassy buildings are to be put into operation simultaneously.

U.S.-Soviet Joint Study of Planet Mars Urged

LD0105082190 Moscow TASS in English 0702 GMT
1 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington May 1 TASS—More than 100,000 Americans have signed the U.S. Planetary Society's declaration calling on the Soviet Union and the United States to explore Mars jointly.

This idea, the declaration notes, captured the fancy of a cross-section of people, "liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, representatives of the Army and industrial circles, politicians, poets, nobel prize winners, art people, athletes, former government members as well as practically all directors of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) since it was founded."

The "Martian declaration" was sponsored by Carl Sagan, a prominent U.S. astronomer, and Roald Sagdeyev, an eminent Soviet astrophysicist. They suggested that the two countries' presidents put an item concerning a joint space mission to Mars on the agenda of their summit meeting, which will be held at the end of May and early in June.

The two researchers believe that since cooperation is not only desirable but necessary, since both the United States and the Soviet Union consider it a priority in space research to study the "red planet."

The two scientists recommended that joint steps be immediately taken within the framework of international space research, including an unmanned flight to Mars in order to sample its soil and bring samples back to Earth. Such thoroughly planned flights could be started under the American "Mars observer" and the Soviet "Mars-94" programmes. "This would be ideal in terms of gauging our resources to plan joint missions," Sagan emphasised.

Scientists believe that the United States could utilise Soviet booster rockets and Soviet experience in the construction of orbital stations during the implementation of its own space programme. The two countries could also fruitfully cooperate in astronomy, planetary explorations and solar studies.

Emphasis in Russian Classes Changes in U.S.

PM0205141190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 May 90 First Edition p 3

[M. Kolesnichenko TASS-attributed report: "Cadets Speak Russian"]

[Text] New York, 1 May—Dead silence reigned in the spacious yet overcrowded classroom of the Military Foreign Languages Institute in Monterey (California). Approximately 30 students were sitting silently at their desks. Each was holding a newspaper and reading with concentration. It all appeared normal, but for one noteworthy circumstance—the future U.S. officers were reading not the U.S. LOS ANGELES TIMES or SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE but the Soviet PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA. Above the blackboard stood this inscription in large letters: "Russian is the language of peace." This is how THE NEW YORK TIMES describes the Russian language lessons in a prestigious U.S. higher military educational institution.

Substantial changes have been made even to the Pentagon's training program as a result of the warming of the international climate and the considerable improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations. The Californian foreign languages institute is a characteristic example of this. Whereas the program used to be based on a study mainly of military vocabulary, it now involves mainly the vocabulary of the spoken language.

It is significant that special courses were created in this educational institution after the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The inspectors who, in accordance with the agreement, will subsequently verify the process of eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in the Soviet Union are trained in Russian on the courses.

"The program of lessons drawn up by leading U.S. linguists is very varied," Institute Commandant Donald Fisher said. "The students not only study grammar and learn words and expressions but also endeavor to communicate with each other in Russian. Soviet movies are screened every day."

China

Taiwan Lifts Visa Ban for USSR Businessmen

PM0105125590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[REUTER-AFP report under the rubric "Foreign Agencies Report": "Taiwan: Entry Restrictions Lifted"]

[Text] The Taiwan Foreign Ministry has announced the lifting of the ban on issuing entry visas for businessmen from the USSR. In addition, the cabinet has given permission to Taiwan firms and entrepreneurs to make investments in the Soviet economy. According to the export and import licenses that have been issued, Taiwan's indirect trade turnover with the Soviet Union increased last year to \$141 million, compared with \$34 million in 1988.

Chinese Paper Cited on Surge in CPC Recruitment

PM0105154790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report under the "Current Affairs" rubric]

[Text]
China

Almost 300,000 inhabitants of China's northern Shanxi Province have applied to join the CPC since the beginning of last summer. According to the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, this shows that "faith in the CPC has struck deep root among the people's masses and that its authority has still further increased." Last year's political events, the newspaper notes, forced people to realize anew that only the Communist Party is capable of leading the country's people along the socialist path of development and working for true prosperity and progress in the PRC.

Soviet, Chinese Scholars View Bilateral Trade

OW2904154290 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1400 GMT 24 Mar 90

[From the "Take the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" program]

[Text] Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences, will talk to us today about trade relations between the Soviet Union and China.

[Titarenko is heard briefly speaking in Russian, fading into Chinese translation] Titarenko believes that the most developed field in Soviet-Chinese economic relations is trade. After 20 years of political confrontation and economic suspension, the Soviet Union and China have been able to quickly expand their economic ties on a large scale in just a few years. From 1981 to 1986, the volume of trade between the two nations grew more than nine times, making the Soviet Union one of China's five largest trading partners. However, the current volume of trade does not fully accord with the two nations' abilities.

As the recent Moscow seminar on the problems of Soviet and Chinese economic reforms proved, Soviet and Chinese economists see eye to eye on this issue in many aspects. For example, Wang Wenxiu, a researcher with the Institute of Quantitative and Technical Economics of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, believes:

[Begin Wang Wenxiu recording] China and the Soviet Union are both large nations. In addition, we are neighbors. We share some 7,000 miles of common border. The Soviet Union is China's traditional market and vice versa. Leaders of both our nations have said that there is enormous potential for Sino-Soviet economic cooperation. However, the potential has yet to be fully exploited. The volume of trade between our two nations is one example. Currently, the volume of Sino-Soviet bilateral trade accounts for merely one percent of the Soviet Union's total trade volume and 3.5 percent of China's. [end recording]

Comrade Titarenko said: Our experience in the past two years indicates that trade contacts are different from production ties in that the former are marked by instability. The possibility for expanding exchanges of goods is also limited. Therefore, it is necessary to develop new forms of trade and economic cooperation. By restoring technological cooperation to assist China's economic projects, the Soviet Union and China are taking a big step in this direction. For instance, according to the governmental level agreements signed by the two nations so far, the Soviet Union will provide complete sets of facilities for 46 Chinese enterprises.

During the seminar, Chinese scholar Wang Wenxiu also proposed developing new forms of trade relations between China and the Soviet Union.

[Begin Wang Wenxiu recording] Trade forms are quite extensive now. Aside from trade at the governmental level, which we call big trade, we also have begun to engage in border trade in regions such as Heilongjiang, Inner Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Jilin; that is, in the regions bordering the Soviet Union. The border trade has been going on quite briskly since 1987. In addition to the border trade, there is trade between localities. For example, Shanghai and Leningrad have established direct contacts and are able to trade with each other directly. Therefore, the forms of trade now include big trade or governmental trade, local trade, and border trade. [end recording]

Therefore, it is fair to infer that the Soviet Union and China enjoy an auspicious beginning in every aspect of their economic and trade cooperation, in spite of some problems that need to be solved immediately.

Northeast Asia

DPRK SPA Session To Be Convened 24 May

SK0305013490 Pyongyang Domestic Service
in Korean 2100 GMT 2 May 90

[Decision by the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK]

[Text] A decision by the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly [SPA] of the DPRK on convening of the SPA session:

The Standing Committee of the SPA of the DPRK decides as follows:

The first session of the 9th SPA is to be convened in Pyongyang on 24 May 1990.

[Signed] The Standing Committee of the SPA of the DPRK

[Dated] 2 May 1990 Pyongyang

DPRK Military Attache Views Military Ties

SK0205052390 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1100 GMT 21 Apr 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The DPRK Embassy in the Soviet Union arranged a press conference for Soviet reporters on 21 April in Moscow to mark the 58th anniversary of the founding of the Korean People's Army [KPA].

Col. Gen. Kim Chong-chang, military attache, spoke at the press conference. In his speech he introduced reporters to the history of the founding of the KPA and (?battles it has fought).

Mentioning the 1950-53 period of the Fatherland Liberation War, he said: Despite the fact that the U.S. troops were numerically superior, that they employed a new way of executing war, and that 15 allies of the United States took part in the war, the Korean people and the KPA stirred up a struggle against the aggressors under the positive support of the fraternal Soviet people and other socialist countries and defended the sovereignty of their fatherland and revolutionary gains.

During the 3 years of the war, the aggressors lost more or less 1.5 millions of men, 12,000 aircraft, 560 military ships, and numerous military equipment of various descriptions.

Presently, the KPA credibly guarantees the nation its development and defends the guard posts of socialism in the (?forefront). In addition to their military duty, the KPA men and officers have made a great contribution to realizing national economic plans.

In recent years, they have built the Sohae Lockgate, and Sunchon Vinalon Complex, and many other plants and automobile expressways.

We offer our wholehearted gratitude to the Soviet people and the soldiers of the Soviet Army for their continued active support to and solidarity with the Korean people in their struggle.

We extend support to the Soviet people in their struggle to effect further reforms [kaengsin] in socialism and to achieve prosperity and improvement in the people's standard of living in (?various areas).

In concluding, Col. Gen. Kim Chung-chang said: We wholeheartedly wish them greater success in the restructuring. Our people and the KPA will as in the past strengthen the ties of alliance with the Soviet Army and the Soviet Union.

Following this, he answered questions raised by the reporters.

One of the questions is as follows: What assessment do you make of the status of and stand on the Korea-Soviet military cooperation?

[Begin Kim Chong-chang recording] Military cooperation between our KPA and the Soviet Army is very favorably developing. To develop the relations of friendship and cooperation between the armies of our two countries is the will and an important task of our people and our KPA soliders. This being the case, we are making an effort to develop our relations in all directions.

In particular, I believe that the relations of cooperation between the navies of our two countries has favorably developed. Moreover, through the mutual visits between the services and branches we have gained good experiences and we are mutually (?dependent).

What we must emphasize at this juncture is that the cooperation between the General Political Bureaus of the armies of the two countries is also being carried out at a high level. We are very satisfied with the fact that the cooperation between the political functionaries in the armies of the two countries is very favorably developing.

I think we should keep strengthening and developing the relations of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Army.

To develop the ties between the armies of the two countries is a matter of mutual concern. As you may know, the United States, Japan, and South Korea are advancing in a direction where they strengthen their military alliance in Asia and the Pacific.

You know it very well, I presume, that the United States, Japan, and South Korea took part in a recent exercise by the Pacific Fleet to pursue such a goal.

A comprehensive examination of the recent exercise in the Pacific shows that this exercise was aimed at blocking the Soviet Union. The primary objective the United States, Japan, and South Korea seek to achieve behind their tripartite military alliance is to keep the Soviet Pacific Fleet from advancing in the direction to the Kuril Islands in an emergency and block it from advancing southward.

In particular, South Korea has recently announced that it would take part even in the "Rimpac" exercise and is expected to take part in the scheduled one.

Under such circumstances in which the enemies are advancing in relations of alliance, I think it is absolutely necessary for us to strengthen our relations of alliance with the Soviet Army.

I believe that peace in the Far East [wondong] must be defended jointly by the Soviet people and Army and the Korean people and Army. [end recording]

New DPRK Ambassador Presents Credentials

SK0205225690 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Soviet President Gorbachev received the credentials of Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, at the Kremlin on 24 April. Following the credentials ceremony, Comrade Gorbachev and the new ambassador held a conversation. On the occasion, First Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Kovalev was on hand.

We will now present the biography of the new ambassador:

Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, was born on 22 November 1927. He received higher education and holds a doctorate in history. For many years following the Korean liberation, he served in important posts of local party organs and of the organs of people's education. He served at organs of the Central Committee of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] from 1947 to 1967. He served as vice director of the DPRK People's Economic College and then as its director from 1967 to 1970. He served as DPRK minister of higher education from 1970 to 1977. He was elected president of the Central Committee of the Red Cross Society of Korea on August 1971. He served again as director of the People's Economic College from 1977 till he was appointed DPRK ambassador to the Soviet Union. Since 1983, he had served as vice chairman of the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK. He has been serving as a member of the WPK Central Committee from 1985. He has been honored with DPRK orders and medals.

Events on USSR-DPRK Cooperation Reported

SK0305043090 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 30 Apr 90

["News on Cooperation" from the "Annals of Friendship" Program]

[Text] [First announcer] On 24 April, Son Song-pil, the DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, presented credentials to the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin. After receiving the credentials, Mikhail Gorbachev held talks with the ambassador. Anatoliy Kovalev, the Soviet deputy foreign minister, was also present at the talks.

[Second announcer] On 24 April, congratulatory events marking the 58th anniversary of the founding of the Korean People's Army [KPA] were held in Pyongyang.

At the meeting, General Choe Kwang, candidate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] and chief of the general staff of the KPA, stressed that the founding of the KPA was a decisive event in the national liberation movement of the Korean people.

He pointed out that during the 1950-53 period, the Soviet Union extended great material and spiritual assistance to the Korean patriots, and the people of the DPRK always remember this.

[First announcer] The 24th (?regular) meeting of the government-level USSR-Korea Consultative Committee on Economic, Scientific and Technological Issues, was held in Pyongyang from 24 to 27 April. The Soviet delegation was led by (?Vladilen Nikitin), first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Korean delegation was headed by Kim Pok-sin, vice-premier of the DPRK State Administration Council.

At the meeting, the issues on developing trade and economic relations between the two sides and on the situation and prospects for scientific and technological cooperation were discussed. The conditions concerning the use of the production capabilities of industrial facilities, which were built in the DPRK with Soviet cooperation, based on the principle of fulfilling obligations in the mutual supply of goods, of friendship, and [word indistinct], were analyzed in an objective manner.

A protocol on the supply of and payment for goods for 1990 between the Soviet Union and the DPRK was signed. According to this protocol, the Soviet Union will export such important products for the DPRK as machines, facilities, crude oil and oil products, and coking coal, while the DPRK will supply cutting and milling machine tools, batteries, [word indistinct], rolled steel, magnesite clinker, and consumer goods to the Soviet Union.

The meeting proceeded in an amicable and friendly atmosphere, and a joint protocol on (?work projects) was also signed.

[Second announcer] An exhibition marking the 58th anniversary of the founding of the KPA was held in the museum of the Black Sea Fleet located in [word indistinct] in Sevastopol city. The items on display showed the history of the founding of the KPA and the role played by the KPA during the anti-colonial struggle period.

Numerous documents and materials were also displayed showing the friendship and multifaceted cooperation between the peoples and armies of the two countries and the Soviet Army's participation in liberating Korea in August 1945 by crushing the Japanese aggressors.

[First announcer] Events marking the 120th birth anniversary of Vladimir Illich Lenin were held in the DPRK. A photo exhibition was held in the Chollima Hall of Culture in Pyongyang. The exhibition showed the life and activities of the leader of the international proletarians and movie houses and theaters staged various programs on Lenin.

The Soviet art film "Nadezhda" about Nadezhda Krupskaya, wife and comrade of Lenin, was presented.

Scholars' Ties With DPRK, ROK Reported

SK0305033890 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 26 Apr 90

[From the Feature Program "Primorskiy Kray"]

[Text] The Far East Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has been greatly interested in developing its ties with foreign countries. Last year alone, functionaries of the Far East Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences visited more than 20 countries in Europe, Asia, and America. Among these countries were (?Chile) and the ROK, which they visited for the first time. According to their traditional views, scholars of the Soviet Far East have attached great significance to the DPRK, a close neighboring country of ours.

(Galina Yebileva), deputy director of the International Relations Department of the Far East Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said:

[Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] Last year, an agreement was signed between the Far East Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the Pyongsong [as heard] Branch of the DPRK Academy of Sciences. This agreement was for the mutual cooperation of geological survey team members, mathematical scholars, maritime geological survey unit members, and oceanographers. According to this agreement, members of the Soviet and Korean survey units for the survey of continental shelves are to work together. We already have an (?experience) in such a successful joint work. In other words, maritime survey unit members of our two countries already have worked together in the continental shelves of democratic Korea since several years ago. Research on seaweed farming, [words indistinct], and research on electric power are not all of Soviet and Korean scholars' matters of concern.

Last year, many successes were achieved in [word indistinct] agreement. For example, archeologists of the History department of the Far East Branch signed a protocol for the joint work of studying the ancient and medieval histories of Democratic Korea and the Primorskiy Kray of the Soviet Union when they visited the DPRK last year.

(Galina Yebileva) continued:

[Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] I anticipate that our cooperation will continue in the future, too. This year, scholars of the Far East Branch of

the Soviet Academy of Sciences will meet many Korean scholars who will come for a protracted training exercise. In June, some student apprentices from Democratic Korea will come to the Biology Research Institute, and the Pacific Oceanology Institute has also completed preparations for receiving Korean scholars.

Scholars of the Far East Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences have also been greatly interested in holding symposiums and seminars with foreign scholars. Not long ago, a symposium on economic cooperation among the countries in the area of the Sea of Japan closed. The symposium was attended by representatives from the research institutes of Japan and the ROK.

At the symposium, we had contacts with ROK scholars. At present, a memorandum on mutual (?understanding) between the Oceanology Institute of the Pacific in Vladivostok and Seoul University has been signed. I believe that this is a good start. At present, a draft of the agreement on scholars' contacts and joint researches—which are of important significance in joining the economy of the Soviet Far East in the economy of Asia and the Pacific—has been arranged.

Soviet-ROK Cooperation in Development Viewed

SK0205051190 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 19 Apr 90

[Unattributed talk from the program on Primorskiy read by an unidentified announcer]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] A symposium entitled "Sea of Japan-90" was held in Vladivostok with the attendance of economists, scientists, and businessmen from Japan, South Korea, and the Far East of the Soviet Union. Our program on this symposium will start with the remarks by (Mikhail Washilyev), an economist at the Maritime Development and Economic and International Affairs Institute. He said: The basic task of countries that participated in this symposium was how to better use maritime resources in the Soviet Union, Japan, and Korea. [passage omitted]

In his report, (Yi Chan-sun), vice president of the ROK World Economy Institute in Seoul, describes the prospects of economic development in the Far East of the Soviet Union when the capital and technology of South Korea and Japan and the resources of the Far East of the Soviet Union are combined. However, all of this is a matter of the future, and prospects for this are not so bright.

[Begin (Yi Chan-sun) recording in Korean] We are interested in all of the fields that you have just mentioned. We have the technology necessary for them. Also, the ROK has grown in a short period of time and faces a shortage of resources. The ROK knows very well how to achieve economic growth because we have experiences. We are more interested in doing business with the Soviet Union than Japan is. However, one problem is that Japan has diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

and the ROK does not. This is the only problem. The ROK is interested in a variety of fields. [end recording]

[Announcer] Despite such big difficulties, the first steps have already been taken for normal economic, cultural, and scientific relations. Hyundai's office opened in Nakhodka, and ships are being repaired in South Korean docks. [passage omitted]

Mr.(Kim Sang-pom), a representative of the ROK Trade Promotion Corporation, said:

[Begin (Kim Sang-pom) recording in Korean] I am one of those who has only worked in the industrial sectors in the ROK for the past 30 years. The Soviet Union has started developing its economy. I think that the Soviet Union's economy will be developed easily. When we started developing our economy, we had a large population and faced a shortage of resources. Also, we have a small territory. However, the Soviet Union has a large territory, with almost all sorts of natural resources, and a large population. This an important strong point. In the Soviet Union, basic science is as well developed as in other countries. Man-made Soviet satellites had already landed on the moon ten years ago. Therefore, if the Soviet Union only introduces the market-economy principle, its economy will drastically develop. We carefully listened to what various Soviet scholars and officials said at the symposium. When we return home, we will examine this. I think that we will advance concrete proposals later. The ROK is briskly doing business at home and in all the countries of the world. We are particularly interested in this region, which is very close to our country. We would like the Soviet Union to first advance concrete proposals. This is because we do not know which projects are priorities for your side. I think that only when we know what sectors we can extend cooperation to, only when we know the Soviet side better, and only when the Soviet side knows us better, can good relations of cooperation be established. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Gorbachev-Li Peng Talks, Ties With PRC Eyed

SK0205234390 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 27 Apr 90

[Station commentator (Yuri Alchiyev's) article]

[Text] Soviet President Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev and Comrade Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, in their talks in the Kremlin on 24 April, expressed the common view that some differences existing between the sides in their stand on certain issues will never become obstacles to further developing mutually useful dialogue and cooperation. Station commentator (Yuri Alchiyev) writes:

Such an attitude is the main point of difference between the Soviet-Sino relations of the present stage and the relations that existed between the two countries in the fifties. In the fifties, Moscow and Beijing alike developed cooperation between the two states and between the two

parties proceeding from [word indistinct] clear precondition which both sides could not recognize as being impractical. In other words, the communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, the ruling parties of the two countries, claimed that the Soviet Union and China should have completely accordant views on all issues of their internal and external policies because of the ideological commonness of the communist parties of the two countries. Of course, you, the listeners, know well how the situation developed at that time because of such a dogmatic attitude toward bilateral relations. In other words, when differences in views emerged between Moscow and Beijing because of well-known reasons, the capitals of the two countries evaluated and regarded such differences in view as an ideological and political heretical act of the other side. This caused the protracted state of inconvenient relations between the two countries.

The Soviet Union and China alike found necessary lessons from the past and made a necessary conclusion for the future. The main point of the conclusion was that relations between socialist countries become genuine, sound, and firm relations only when such relations are based on the rights of complete independence in the political way of thinking and in the practical politics of each country. The Soviet Union and China alike stressed this point in the Kremlin talks. No one has the right to force one's understanding of certain issues or the situation upon the other side.

In the joint communique on the talks between Comrade Gorbachev and Comrade Li Peng, both sides expressed the common views that there is no fixed line or model that all countries should obligatorily follow in realizing the socialist ideal and principles. The joint communique also stressed that each country has its own history, its characteristics, and its own development level and that these points should be taken into consideration. Therefore, there is one condition that Moscow and Beijing alike considers to be important. In other words, there is the condition that the development of Soviet-Sino relations should not do harm to relations with third countries and to relations of each side with third countries.

The period since Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China in May of last year has shown that the two countries have strictly adhered to this important principle. Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China last May announced the complete normalization of Soviet-Sino relations. In the Moscow talks this time the Soviet Union and China reaffirmed that this principle will be one obligatory condition for the further development of the future's bilateral relations. I regard this reaffirmation as an additional guarantee for stable bilateral relations.

Television Reports Demonstration in Ulaanbaatar

LD0205220190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 2 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent T. Lordkipanidze in Ulaanbaatar]

[Text] Recently we have had much to say about the turbulent changes in the countries of Eastern Europe. However, complex processes of renewal are taking place on another of the country's borders 700—the Far Eastern border. Changes in Mongolia have long been imminent. Many complex problems that have amassed over long years have to be resolved by the inhabitants of the country, and one can already say that one should not expect easy paths and simple solutions.

[Lordkipanidze] Ulaanbaatar is apprehensively awaiting events whose character no one is venturing to predict. There is a chain of Interior Ministry soldiers and border guards in front of Government House and there are thousands of demonstrators in (Sukhe-bator) square. There are also banners, placards and slogans, saying: Where is the equality of parties? Surely people's power cannot have an iron face? and What am I and the unemployed to do? [video shows extended line of soldiers standing with linked arms in front of building, masses of demonstrators in square, and close-up of some of their banners]

Rallies including ones that have been just as crowded as the present rally have recently become a normal feature in Ulaanbaatar. Recently the People's Great Hural Presidium adopted a decision banning demonstrations and other crowded assemblies in the central square of the Mongolian capital, and yet it is precisely on to this square that the demonstrators have come.

Later a government statement will appraise the turbulent demonstration in Sukhe Bator Square as an attempt by a group of extremists to seize power, and yet representatives of the country's leadership and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee have sat down at the negotiating table with the leaders of the mongolian Democratic Union and other sociopolitical movements and parties. At those talks—Ratnasumbaliyn Gonchigdorj, chairman of the Executive Council of the Social Democratic Movement, said: We have been striving first and foremost to have our main demands fulfilled—namely, the creation of a provisional Hural and an Extraordinary People's council with the equal participation of all the country's political forces. Agreement in principle on the creation of a provisional hural has been achieved. Despite existing differences we hope on all the fundamental issues to reach an agreement acceptable to both sides. [video shows small group of demonstrators talking to soldiers and then close-up of Gonchigdorj giving interview]

TASS Reports on Demonstrations

LD0305083190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0657 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 3 May (TASS)—On Wednesday afternoon a group of members of the Mongolian Democratic Union [MDU] and other new political movements started a sit-down demonstration by the public garden adjoining the central square of Ulaanbaatar. The number of demonstrators is now about 60. In front of

them are banners with slogans demanding democratic changes in the activity of state and government institutions. This is also being announced by orators through loudspeakers set up here. Messages coming in here from some labor collectives supporting this action are being read out. Young people are distributed newspapers, materials from congresses and other publications of new political organizations.

The demonstration is being held in token of solidarity with the 15 MDU supporters who started a hunger strike on 28 April in the town of Moron, the center of Hovsgol Aimak. They are demanding the lifting of the resolution of the presidium of the People's Great Hural on rules for holding demonstrations and meetings in population centers of the country.

The health of four of the 15 hunger strikers is causing alarm, and they have been transferred to the local hospital, TASS correspondent Kim Boldokhonov was told by E. Bat-Uul, leader of the MDU. But even in the hospital they continue to refuse food.

We, E. Bat-Uul pointed out, expect an answer from the official authorities to our demands: to lift the unlawful resolution of the People's Great Hural on the rules for holding meetings and demonstrations.

Mongolian Trade Union Platform Published

LD0205131990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0918 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 2 May (TASS)—The main aim of the Associated Union of Mongolian Workers is the creation of a humane, democratic socialism. This is stated in the new union's platform, published on Tuesday in the newspaper UNEN.

The action program of the Associated Union of Mongolian Workers in the economic sphere envisages the development of various forms of socialist ownership of the means of production, and supports private ownership without the exploitation of others' labor. The union will come out in favor of observing the principles of socialist distribution according to labor. It supports the formation of a market mechanism within the framework of the country's economic policy, and the expansion of economic independence for enterprises.

In the social sphere, the Associated Union of Mongolian Workers favors guaranteeing the true rights of working people over the means of production, and eliminating the deformations which have led to unemployment for some of the population.

The union supports the activities of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary party and other forces in the renewal of society and in the interests of the country and the working class. The Associated Union of Mongolian

Workers will comprehensively cooperate with the international workers' movement, strengthen friendship with other countries, and conduct a struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Deputy Premier Phong Interviewed on USSR Visit

BK2904101790 Moscow in Thai to Thailand
1100 GMT 28 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet-Thai History File" feature]

[Text] Thai Deputy Prime Minister Phong Sarasin visited Moscow during 15-19 April for official consultations. He gave an interview to Radio Moscow. The following is the recording of the interview:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified Interviewer] Now that you have ended your official visit, what is your assessment of the visit?

[Phong] First, I would like to tell you that the purpose of my visit is to acquaint myself with Soviet leaders. The visit will give the private sector team accompanying me the opportunity to learn about the trade and political situation in the Soviet Union after the recent changes.

I met several senior Soviet officials, such as the two deputy prime ministers, the minister of trade, and the minister of foreign economic relations. We discussed economic cooperation. I told the Soviet officials that Thailand exports several billion U.S. dollars worth of goods to the EC, showing that the quality and prices of Thai products are recognized in world markets. We discussed ways to expand bilateral trade, currently relatively small. I offered to sell several products to the Soviet Union and buy Soviet products. My delegation told Soviet leaders that trade is a two-way affair—buying and selling. We offered to buy cement, steel rods, and cotton. The products which we proposed to sell are industrial products such as electrical appliances, textile products, gems, rice, and tapioca. We have reached the conclusive part of a deal on the purchase of Thai rice and tapioca. The Soviet official I met yesterday inquired about the price of 200,000-300,000 tonnes of rice. I now have the quotations from Bangkok and will inform him tomorrow. I hope the rice deal can be successfully concluded. On tapioca, Soviet representatives will go to Bangkok next month to negotiate a deal.

[Interviewer] From what you have discussed with Soviet officials, what do you think can be done to remove the obstacles to bilateral trade?

[Phong] I have already suggested several ways to the concerned Soviet officials. Our systems are different. The system in Thailand is free trade, while the Soviet system is still undergoing changes. There is a misunderstanding on the Soviet part which thinks that the Thai Government can give orders to the private sector. I

informed the Soviet officials concerned that the government merely asks for cooperation and provide support to the private sector. In the Soviet Union every transaction is done by the government. In Thailand trade transactions are done by the private sector. Therefore, cooperation must be requested from the private sector to increase trade with the Soviet Union. I also stressed the price and quality of Thai products.

[Interviewer] In the Soviet Union, the conduct of trade by the private sector is only at the infant stage. As a businessman, what do you think can be done to promote more trade between the two countries? Considering the long-established diplomatic relations between Thailand and the Soviet Union, the volume of bilateral trade is small compared to trade between the Soviet Union and Korea where there are no diplomatic relations.

[Phong] On Thailand's part, we will have to get more information about quality products, such as machinery and tractors, from the Soviet Union, for the Thais. The Soviet Union wants to sell machinery to Thailand. Trade between Thailand and the Soviet Union is only at the starting stage. Korea-USSR trade cannot be used as a yardstick. I am here to help expand trade. I feel that bilateral trade will begin to increase because the leadership level of both countries understand each other. Now we will try to get the private sector to understand.

[Interviewer] I think you are aware of the Soviet limitations regarding joint ventures with Thailand. What is your opinion of the possibilities of joint Thai-Soviet business ventures? Soviet high-technology cannot be compared with the West and Japan. What do you think of labor-intensive joint ventures between our countries?

[Phong] Joint ventures between Thailand and the Soviet Union must be in areas that do not involve high technology, such as fishing. There are many basic areas which could support joint Thai-Soviet ventures. For example, we could set up canned food factories here using fish from the Soviet Union. A lot of negotiations on this matter have already been held. Once a joint venture is established more will follow. I feel that at this initial stage we should study joint investment in basic industries such as fishing and canned food.

[Interviewer] How about establishing companies to handle counter trade between Thailand and the Soviet Union? Do you think there is a possibility that some could be set up in the near future?

[Phong] As far as I know, there are such joint Thai-Soviet companies. This matter has to proceed gradually because the Soviet system has just been changed. One cannot expect to proceed quickly at a grand scale because payment and currency obstacles exist. It will take time.

[Interviewer] About the Thai policy of transforming the battlefield in Indochina into a marketplace, is this the result of greater competition for the East European market after political changes there?

[Phong] You must separate the issues of Cambodia and East Europe. Cambodia is Thailand's neighbor. We do not want to see fighting in our neighboring country. We want to see peace in Cambodia and would prefer that they concentrate on the economy instead of war. As far as Eastern Europe is concerned, Thailand wants to strengthen its economy and befriend every country. As economic and political changes have occurred in East Europe, we must explore contacts because we want to have friends. Because the door is open, we must become good friends and trade with each other to strengthen our economies so that our people will live better. We want to see world peace.

[Interviewer] What has impressed you the most during your current visit?

[Phong] I am impressed by the hardworking Soviet leaders' determination to promote greater bilateral relations and trade.

[Interviewer] Thank you very much. [end recording]

Near East & South Asia

Algerian Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry

PM0105083390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 27 April Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the Soviet Union, at the latter's request. During their conversation they discussed questions concerning security and cooperation in the Mediterranean and topical problems relating to the situation in the Near East and North Africa.

Najibullah Sends Message of Thanks to Gorbachev

PM0105115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Afghan President Najibullah message of thanks to Gorbachev]

[Text] To USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Your Excellency, Mikhail Sergeyevich,

It gives me pleasure on behalf of the people and government of the Republic of Afghanistan and personally to express appreciation for the congratulations on the 12th anniversary of our 27 April revolution.

In these bleak days of defending the motherland, the government of the Republic of Afghanistan and all our country's patriotic, peace-loving forces remember with a sense of gratitude, as always, the support and assistance given by the people and government of the Soviet Union.

The government of the Republic of Afghanistan is making every effort to implement the policy of national reconciliation, end the fratricidal war, and ensure lasting peace.

We welcome the restructuring of Soviet society's life, the development of glasnost and democracy in your country, and the creation—thanks to the Soviet leadership's efforts—of an international climate conducive to strengthening world peace and international security.

I sincerely and wholeheartedly wish the friendly people and government of the Soviet Union great achievements, health, and new successes in this great, humanist mission.

[Signed] Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan.

Gorbachev Congratulates India's Gupta on Election

PM0105143990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Undated M. Gorbachev message to Indian Communist Party chief Indrajit Gupta]

[Text] To Comrade Indrajit Gupta, general secretary of the Indian Communist Party National Council.

Please accept my cordial congratulations on your election as general secretary of the Indian Communist Party National Council.

I wish you success in your activity for the benefit of the Indian people and in the interests of peace and socialism. M. Gorbachev.

Background to Disturbances in Kashmir Surveyed

PM0205133990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent I. Sharov report: "Difficult Times in Kashmir"]

[Text] Delhi—Reassuring news came from New York a few days ago: India's Minister of External Affairs I.K. Gujral and Pakistan's Minister of Foreign Affairs S. Yaqub Khan held "frank, businesslike, and useful" talks on the Kashmir problem. In spite of a number of contrasting approaches, the heads of the two neighboring states' foreign policy departments found it necessary to stress in a joint statement their willingness to resolve the contradictions by peaceful means, pursuing a policy of restraint and mutual understanding. Moreover, the Indian side stated categorically that Pakistan must stop supporting the separatists in Kashmir. S. Yaqub Khan for his part rejected this demand. He said that no such support exists.

Meanwhile the situation on the Indo-Pakistani border in Kashmir remains tense.

In the historical calendar of Indo-Pakistani relations, the years 1948, 1965, and 1971 evoke distressing recollections. The neighbors, who have so much in common, have taken up arms three times. And all on account of Kashmir. Is it possible, thousands of people ask with understandable alarm, that blood might be shed once more and that gun smoke will once more envelop the heavenly valley? There are plenty of causes for concern. Dangerous events on the Indo-Pakistani border have been developing for several months, at times verging on combat operations. Aggressive voices from the Pakistani side express readiness to "fight at least a thousand years to liberate their Kashmiri brothers." The Indians are appealing to the nation to be ready to repulse hostile forces.

Kashmir is suffering. The separatists' terrorist actions supported from outside have resulted in casualties and a flood of refugees, struck a blow at the economy, and upset normal life which is already difficult. The presence of the military and the police here, the rigidity of the curfew in a number of cities in the valley, frequent searches, searches for arms caches, and persecutions of fighters from the "Kashmir Liberation Front" organization have tormented people and filled them with despair and hopelessness. And it is primarily ordinary people—whether Hindus or Muslims—who are experiencing all these hardships.

The center's blunders are also being used to inflame anti-Indian sentiments. There is dissatisfaction among the state's population with the way ties have developed between the center and Kashmir for many years. It seems that the "surplus principle," whose effect is being felt by other periphery states, particularly Assam, has predominated here. It has resulted in economic backwardness of the remote areas, absence of industry, and mass unemployment. I myself have often heard Kashmiris say that they, the native inhabitants of the state, are as it were in a social backwater: Entry into reputable academic establishments, offices, banks and so on is more difficult for them. Corruption, the arbitrariness of local officials and individual police officials, and the poverty of most of the population have long been a breeding ground for the Kashmiris' profound dissatisfaction with the state of affairs which prevails in the state. Extremist-minded young people are exploiting the mood of the population's Muslim section to whip up a campaign against the center, the Hindus, and the entire Indian population. Separatists are agitating for the expulsion of "infidels" from the state. It is easy to imagine the blaze that could flare up if the Muslim fundamentalists' inflammatory speeches caused Hindu fundamentalists to rise up in a struggle to defend their faith. And who knows how close this is?

The Indian Government understands the complexity of the situation and is doing a lot to defuse it without using force, by means of dialogue and patient talks. Almost all the main political parties, who have sent their representatives to the special partywide committee on Kashmir,

adhere to this position. The post of minister for Kashmir affairs has been created in the central government. India has often proposed that Islamabad embark on a constructive dialogue aimed at finding the right path and reducing the level of tension in the Kashmir situation. The Indian side believes that the suspension of Pakistan's interference in the state's affairs is one of the most important conditions in solving the question.

House Resolution Recognizing Jerusalem Criticized

90UF0125A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 29 Apr 90 p 3

[V. Mikhaylov comment: "'Unholy' Decision"]

[Text] Press agencies have given out the news that the U.S. Congress House of Representatives has passed a resolution recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

This decision may be called nothing other than blasphemous. A city, the first mention of which pertains to the middle of the second millennium before our era, was, following the end to Britain's Palestine Mandate in 1947, by a decision of the UN General Assembly, to have become an independent administrative unit with special international conditions under UN control. This was done in consideration of the fact that Jerusalem is revered as their sacred place by three religions: Christianity, Islam, and Judaism.

But what was the position of the world community toward the rulers of the Zionist state openly pursuing a policy of annexation and expansion! Following the 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli war unleashed by Tel Aviv, the city was divided into two parts: East, which reverted to Jordan, and West, which reverted to Israel. But in 1950 Israel individually even declared the city its capital and in 1967 seized it entirely.

The question of Jerusalem is one of a set of problems which it is essential to resolve in the process of a Near East peace settlement. Progress had been discerned of late, seemingly, in unblocking the situation in this extremely tense and explosive region. However, compromise suits far from everyone, it seems. This is indicated also by the not simply irresponsible but extremely dangerous decision adopted in Washington. Americans with common sense recognize this. Congressman David Obey immediately declared that the steps taken on Capitol Hill would lead to a further growth of tension in the Near East. He proved right: To judge from recent reports, the actions of the U.S. congressmen were followed by statements of extremists which are regrettable, but not surprising. One organization, for example, threatened that unless the decision is annulled, terrorist actions against Americans will follow.

Terrorism is condemned by all civilized peoples, but it is essential in adopting such decisions not to forget that it nonetheless still exists and to think about how to prevent a new outburst of it. And in the broad plane, to think about political responsibility.

King Fahd Sends Koran to Soviet Muslims*LD0205063790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0600 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] King Fahd of Saudi Arabia has presented a million copies of the Koran to the USSR's Muslims. The gift is a truly royal one: the customs duty and Aeroflot air freight have been paid. The entire operation to transport the Muslims' sacred book is estimated at \$42 million.

Sub-Saharan Africa**'New Soviet Attitude' Toward Africa Viewed***LD0205211990 Moscow in English to Africa
1700 GMT 2 May 90*

[Summary] The first ever African tour by a Soviet foreign minister and new initiatives in the continent suggest a new Soviet attitude, according to Yuriy Yukalov, head of the African department at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The old cold war attitudes are outdated, he says, and it is in the interests of all to settle differences by dialogue. Changes in the continent have led to savings for the USSR.

[Yukalov] "Now that Namibia is independent there is no need to support the South-West African People's Organization that waged an armed struggle for the independence of its country. With the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and Namibia the aggression stopped and we are reducing the shipments of arms and ammunition to the Angolan Armed Forces and Cuban troops in Angola that helped to repel the South African aggression. "Positive changes in the military-political situation in the region have allowed the reduction of the number of Soviet military advisers and specialists in Angola, Mozambique, and other frontline countries. It is not a matter of billions [of rubles] like in Afghanistan but we spent millions during the period of confrontation. However, all of these sums are insignificant compared to the prospects of opening up for establishing truly mutually beneficial cooperation with countries in southern Africa, Angola, and Mozambique, in particular cooperation that used to be simply impossible due to the absence of security in those countries.

"There are prospects of trade and economic ties profitable for this country. I believe that Soviet policy directed at the political settlement of conflict in southern Africa is quite profitable. The war cost Angola \$12-15 billion, Mozambique \$15 billion. The Soviet investment in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group can be expected to recoup its cost—more profitable than to continue hostilities. Soviet diplomacy is working for peace elsewhere in Africa. The USSR is ready to establish relations with the Republic of South Africa but in the meantime continues to adhere to the United Nations boycott until apartheid has been abolished.

Borisov Comments on Tanzania Union, Lithuania*EA0105115890 Moscow International Service in Swahili
1730 GMT 29 Apr 90*

[Text] On 26 April 1964, two republics, Tanganyika and Zanzibar, united to form the United Republic of Tanzania. The following is a commentary by our correspondent, Vladimir Borisov:

Tanzania is the only country Africa so far to set an example by two independent states to implement the concept of forming a union. The union has existed for more than a quarter of a century and it is time to establish whether all is well.

Of late the union has undergone severe trials testing its strength. These trials were not merely the outcome of tribalism, political differences, and the greed of certain politicians. Since the beginning of 1970 the steep decline in the export of cloves, which is the backbone of the Zanzibar economy, has given rise to social discontent among people of various views. This led to religious disturbances which revealed early signs of the formation of an opposition political party.

There are murmurs by the majority of the 600,000 people in Zanzibar, ranging from those asking for changes in the union to those asking for outright secession. Zanzibaris themselves admit that these strong feelings did not exist in the past, because the people of Zanzibar are patient by nature.

What steps should then be taken to bring about a stable union? Finding solutions is no easy task. It is difficult to ignore the similar situation facing the USSR, explains our correspondent. Even the leaders of Tanzania themselves express the need to learn from the events in Eastern Europe and in the USSR itself. Therefore the lesson of perestroika in the USSR is that any union or federation must give equal rights to all sides in internal self-government to safeguard the national political, economic, and other rights of all parts of the union. This can be achieved through dialogue on an equal basis to avoid political greed and tribalism and the central government must show goodwill toward achieving success. This may sound as though it is meant to teach others what to do, but I feel solutions could be found in many situations if a great deal had not been ignored, as in the case of Lithuania which wishes to secede, and other Baltic republics in the USSR. But I should not continue comparing the two. I do not think the time has passed in Africa for the forming of unions or federations.

The basis of the union between the isles of Zanzibar and Pemba with mainland Tanzania is at present, in my opinion, still stronger than anything that could separate Zanzibaris from mainland Tanzanians. They share ancient historical links and I do not think that even Zanzibar, if it secedes, could avoid the problems facing the whole of the African continent. These problems are

numerous and a solutions demand cooperation. However, the call by the United Nations can only be realized if implemented in keeping with the times.

East Europe

United Germany in NATO Called 'Negative'

PM0205183090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 May 90 First Edition p 4

[Aleksandr Stepanov article under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Let Us Call Things by Their Names"]

[Text] All that has happened in Central Europe in the last six months is sometimes likened to a "peace explosion," instantly changing a significant proportion of the continent's political realities. And it is true that before October 1989 the probability of Germany's unification could only be evaluated theoretically, while after the 18 March elections, which decided the GDR's fate, it was necessary to think seriously about its consequences—foreign policy, economic, and even moral and psychological consequences. And these, it is true, are mixed—especially for our country.

The last thing I want to do is to intimidate anyone with the idea of a Germany "from the Mosel to the Oder"—I think the strategic parity between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is capable of withstanding such tests. But the positive development of the Helsinki process depends to a very great extent on what the military-political status of this newborn, or rather reborn, giant will be. And whereas neither we nor any other country can influence the course of unification—the desire of the inhabitants of both German states is being realized—the position of a united Germany in European and therefore world politics is another matter. Here much will depend on the European community's [soobshchestvo] approach.

I use the broad formulation "European community" deliberately, because I believe that this question must ultimately be decided not on the basis of the formula "two plus four," but rather, as has already been proposed in the press, on the basis of the formula "two plus 33"—that is, by all the participants in the Helsinki process, but more of this in a moment.

For the time being, let us leave it to the scholars to analyze the full diversity of theoretically possible options, and talk about the most important ones. At first glance, there are two of them: Germany as a full member of NATO, and Germany as a neutral state. Let us begin with the first. Incidentally, it has already been discussed in our press, which is a good thing in itself. Let me give you my opinion. I believe that the implementation of this option would, for us, be morally painful and militarily undesirable. Foreseeing accusations of not having grown out of the rudiments of the old thinking, I will say this: The armies of the NATO countries are still, alas, a reality which takes a concrete material and statistical

form: so many tanks, aircraft, guns, personnel, and so forth. And these forces will come closer to the USSR's borders, rather than receding. For the time being, I believe, only political theorists can consider what functions NATO could fulfill when the East-West conflict finally becomes a thing of the past and whether the bloc will continue to exist at all. Of course, the changes in Europe have considerably lessened the practical threat of armed clashes. But all the same, NATO has not yet become an amorphous political club, but is still a military organization, which none of its members denies. There is no denying that the confrontation between military blocs in Europe must be eradicated, but who can say that the shortest, logical way to achieve that is through the considerable strengthening of one of them?

There is also this argument: Membership of NATO will block the possible expansionist aspirations of a united Germany. This cannot be ruled out in theory, but in practice it is highly dubious. History shows that Germany has always followed a course based on the paramountcy of its own national interests as the Germans see them at any given moment. And the only guarantee of peaceable aspirations on its part is its own policy, not the NATO "curb." Of course, I remember and assess highly Chancellor H. Kohl's words that only peace should ever emanate from German soil. And I would very much like to be sure that these words will always be in accordance with reality. But after all, H. Kohl is not FRG chancellor in perpetuity...

Let us suppose that the option of Germany becoming a NATO member is realized after all. What then? Universal disaster? Of course not! But—let us try to call things by their names—it would be a perceptible foreign policy negative for the Soviet Union. Perhaps the most serious, even, in the whole of postwar history. Here the American saying springs to mind: "There is no such thing as a free lunch." And we, too, will have to pay the price. For what? For "developed socialism," which for a long time we stubbornly imposed on our East European partners. For the self-confidence with which we were ready to confront virtually the whole world. And there is no point in trying to sweeten this bitter pill with reminders about the triumph of the new political thinking. This thinking presupposes the abandonment of the old black-and-white diplomacy without nuances, the reliance on brute force and the nuclear missile fist, but it does not imply the abandonment of national interests. And it does not, of course, negate the truth that it is still the countries that are politically stable and economically mighty that have the highest position in the world.

But let us also examine the second option, which is sometimes called "traditional," because it has been in existence in the political lexicon for nearly 40 years. After its implementation a neutral Germany would emerge, a country with a reduced level of arms and armed forces. A peace treaty with that country would perhaps be analogous to the treaty our country signed with Austria in 1955. Despite the lack of any striking novelty, which is so popular now, this option even now

seems to me to be preferable. People say it could create a new, mighty "magnetic pole" in the center of Europe, even a "bone of contention," since both we and the Americans, they say, will each try to drag Germany over to our side. Here I can only reiterate what I said above—this pole, if you think about it, already exists; Germany will always proceed primarily on the basis of its own interests.

This option does not suit the Americans, primarily because they do not want to lose their direct military presence in Europe. And in order to stay there themselves and keep Germany in NATO, they propose esoteric solutions: The military border of the Atlantic Treaty will not extend beyond the present FRG-GDR border; Soviet troops could remain on the territory of the present GDR for the time being—how tempting, our soldiers in a NATO country! All these options are, of course, temporary and are not intended as serious, long-term solutions. They want to help reconcile us to the idea of the whole of Germany belonging to NATO... But the aim should be, I am convinced, for Germany to become neutral. Difficult? No one is arguing; it is difficult. But why not set a task worthy of a state that has proclaimed the new thinking to be the basis of its policy?

And this new thinking could now be a major support—and not only for politicians and the military in our country. Many West European capitals are currently clarifying their military-political strategy and considering options for NATO's transformation. Take France; its return to the NATO military organization, however desirable it may be to Washington and London, is still unlikely. But options for transforming European defense to a different basis are being discussed in Paris—in military spheres, as well as in the press. In short, the idea is that the EEC should concern itself with questions of defense on a European scale. True, this is at present prevented by an article of the Treaty of Rome excluding military matters from the community's sphere of competence. But the very thrust of the quest is, you will agree, rather symptomatic.

In short, the unification of Germany is a natural process, foreseen, it is now claimed, by many, although until recently it was not examined in our press. Perhaps this last is the reason why we are receiving so many worried letters, especially from elderly people whose knowledge of war does not come from books. I am convinced that misgivings are now completely pointless and unfounded. But very keen attention to German affairs is needed. And not only on our part.

Here we are approaching what we were talking about at the beginning—the last element of the formula, denoted by the figure "33." It is a question of a joint quest for a new European security structure, without a split on the bloc principle, but, on the contrary, with a pooling of everyone's efforts. Wasted time will be very costly. As yet, as USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin said in an interview, there has only been one experts'

meeting even under the "two plus four" formula. Will diplomacy lag behind the development of events?

It is the all-European approach to the problem that appears preferable now because a just and final solution to the question of German unification could be an entirely concrete matter for the inhabitants of the future "common home," and, moreover, a first step toward the unity of Europe.

Hungary Proclaims 1956 Events 'Revolution'

*LD0205204790 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT
2 May 90*

[Text] Budapest May 3 TASS—The first law, passed by Hungary's newly elected parliament on Wednesday, proclaimed the 1956 events a revolution and liberation struggle.

It declared October 23, the day of the 1956 revolution's beginning and of the proclamation of the Hungarian Republic in 1989, a national holiday.

The parliamentary session will continue on Thursday.

Croatian Democrats Aim at 'National Isolation'

*PM0105133990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 90 p 3*

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Khlystun: "Chops a la Croat"]

[Text] Belgrade—Nationalists are winning the free elections in the Republic of Croatia.

The League of Communists, recently renamed the Party of Democratic Change of Croatia, lost the first round of free elections to the Republican Assembly (Parliament). The lion's share of its seats will now be taken by representatives of a nationalist party—the Croatian Democratic Union, headed by the former communist and now fervent anticommunist Franjo Tudjman.

Assessing this event, one can say without stretching a point that the Croatian Communists proved incapable of open warfare against the opposition. The election campaign was conducted limply, clumsily, and often according to the old routines. But on the other hand their opponents showed really exceptional artistic abilities. Croatian Democratic Union supporters organized concerts, shows, and during the actual elections even a big carnival at which a huge bull was spit-roasted and "every voter" could have some meat.

But the crucial factor in Tudjman's victory was, of course, not the bull but an elementary play on people's nationalist sentiments, the promise to give Croats freedom. I think that the ordinary voter simply got tired of past leaders' numerous promises and gave their votes to the first person to say: Croatia can overcome the crisis under its own steam.

But if you look carefully, Tudjman's program contains no serious proposals for the republic's economic reconstruction nor any strong demands for changes in the social sphere. The Croatian Democratic Union's trump card is national isolation, right up to being an independent state.

It is precisely on the basis of this plan that the Croatian Democratic Union's supporters want to bring their republic into the "European" home. However, many Western observers chorus that with such intentions Croatia has no business in Europe.

Elections in two SFRY republics—Slovenia and Croatia—have shown clearly that for the time being nationalist tendencies are winning here. But here is a question which will soon arise in the national elections: In Slovenia, figuratively speaking the Slovenes have won, and in Croatia the Croats have won, but who will win in Yugoslavia...?

Kondrashov on East Europe, Waning Soviet Power

PM0305085190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondent Stanislav Kondrashov report: "Our Place in the World, or Home Thoughts From Abroad"]

[Text] Berlin-Bonn-Moscow—"Russia has always wavered between anarchy and dictatorship. It seems a downright impossible task to move on from this to democracy. And you have very little time. Gorbachev is riding a charging tiger, but the tiger is hungry and wants to eat..."

Those words were spoken in Bonn, in the Bundestag building, by one of its deputies with an international reputation. Egon Bahr is a prominent Social Democrat and authority on European security problems. We had come to find out his opinion of how these problems look in the new circumstances, where, as it unites, Germany is increasing its might and becoming immeasurably stronger than France or Britain, and East Europe is changing radically, toppling out of the former Soviet orbit. Egon Bahr systematically set out in German his well thought-out and quite convincing concept for the transitional period between bloc security and security outside blocs, postbloc security.

These alarming words about Russia teetering between anarchy and dictatorship and Gorbachev riding a hungry tiger came outside the framework of the conversation, as it were, as a parting shot. Despite being an aside, they expressed the main factor among all the factors that will determine Europe's future destiny. If you think about it, it is not the new, united Germany which will emerge over the next 18 or 24 months that is the greatest unknown quantity in Europe's future—although we have gotten accustomed to thinking this, applying the yardsticks of the past to the future, and cruel historical memory, the 12 years of the "1,000-year Reich," and the German

attack on the Soviet Union entitle us to do so. If you use present criteria, it will transpire that the transition to a new Germany is clearer than the transition to a new Soviet Union. A united Germany is emerging on the political basis of West Germany, where stable democratic parliamentary structures have taken shape. We still lack these structures. A divided nation's centripetal forces have been rapidly activated in East and West Germany. In our country the emerging democracy that has succeeded a totalitarian regime in conditions of an economic crisis has roused centrifugal forces which are exacerbating instability in the largest power on the European Continent. Given the current excellent state of the West German economy it is easier for them to secure new economic and social stability, despite all the complex problems of unification, than it is for us.

Thus it is not so much the future of Germany as our own future—that of the Soviet Union and its perestroika—that is raising the question of Europe's future once again in a world that has been turned upside down and is only just beginning to right itself again.

I would like to begin the last part of my comments on my trip to Poland, the GDR, the FRG, and Czechoslovakia with that general conclusion.

I went in order to examine on the spot the process of German unification and its neighbors' reaction to it. But the pressure of my immediate impressions smashed my preconceived plan. The new horizons of two Slavic countries thrilled me (see "Prague Spring-90" in IZVESTIYA No. 104 and "Warsaw Spring-90" in No. 111). I realized that the railroad stations and way stations through which the swift express train of German unification is traveling can be described without delay only from Berlin and Bonn. My colleagues—IZVESTIYA's permanent correspondents—are making a good job of this. The main thing is that, wherever we travel, whatever our plans, we do so to have a better understanding of ourselves, our problems, our country in its relations with particular areas of the world, and its turbulent times. Especially as the Lithuanian crisis was the number one news story in the newspapers in the various capitals during my trip, pushing the German question into second place and once again forcing everyone to ponder instability in the Soviet Union.

Variations on Egon Bahr's parting shot were heard from other people with whom I spoke. I finished the Warsaw section of my notes with a warning from Adam Michnik, the well-known journalist and "Solidarity" figure: "Chaos cannot be reformed." He was referring to the pessimistic scenario for the development of perestroika whereby the political center ground, which is already not wide enough, narrows under the onslaught of the strengthening right and left wings. When we met with Hans Modrow, he still held the post of GDR prime minister—the last in a 40-year line of communist premiers. After the March GDR elections, which brought victory for the Christian Democrats there, he still had a few days left before his resignation. He gave an interview

in his former office in the massive gray Council of Ministers building, which already looked deserted. His words were precise and somewhat dry; he looked calm but seemed sad. Modrow had a difficult burden: He had to make the break with Honecker's authoritarian regime, under which he himself had suffered for his honesty and independent behavior, and lead East Germany through the first phase of the transitional period toward merger with the FRG. This was the subject of the interview—one of the last at that time, when Modrow had already ceased to be of interest to journalists and had not yet become an object of attention for historians (See "We Are Not Coming Empty-Handed" in No. 90).

After the interview he asked Vladimir Lapskiy, IZVESTIYA's Berlin correspondent, and me to stay behind for a few minutes. He began to speak Russian. At one time Moscow was Mecca for him—as it was for every Communist. A great deal was linked with it not only politically but also personally. Modrow remembered studying at the Higher Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] School in Veshnyaki in the early 1950's. Those were difficult times, the Soviet Union had still not recovered from the war, but people's mood was brighter than it is now and "the food situation was better." Modrow did not talk about the choice of anarchy or dictatorship, but his remark concerning foodstuffs showed such knowledge of our life that it injected into the conversation a dimension that is peculiarly ours, wretched, and beyond the understanding of inhabitants of developed countries.

When we asked him what advice he would give to our country and the CPSU with his fresh dramatic experience, Modrow diplomatically declined to give "cross-border advice." But his advice was essentially this: When settling key questions, seek broad consensus among all forces interested in seeking political solutions, thus finding a path from broad democratic pluralism to broad national responsibility. According to Modrow, the road from the opposition at the "roundtable" to the formation of the government of national responsibility in early February was of crucial significance for preserving stability in the GDR.

In Bonn I met with the German top man. The vast Helmut Kohl belies the old and oft-confirmed observation that history selects people of small stature for its great work. But the chancellor does not so much shape history as ride on the crest of its wave as the uniter of Germany. An enviable role. We conducted an interview with the chancellor in his official residence (See "Only Peace From German Soil" in No. 97), along with IZVESTIYA's Bonn correspondent Yevgeniy Bovkun. During the interview he kept to the specified topic—German unification and European unification. But it was still quite a long conversation. As the reader has already guessed, during the conversation the chancellor hinted—with all due courtesy—at his concern over the course of affairs in the Soviet Union. The man on the crest of history's wave intimated that relations between our two countries—natural neighbors—will be better

than ever before during the last decade of the century, indeed, of the whole millennium, if the changes in the Soviet Union keep on going in the same direction.

The division of Germany embodied the division of Europe. A great many plans have now emerged whose authors—from Moscow to Washington and from Berlin to Bonn—agree that German unification must be accompanied by European unification. Although everyone realizes that the former has now picked up such speed that the latter will hardly be able to keep up, everyone approves in principle of the idea of synchronization, which precludes a revival of German revanchism.

However, in a situation where everything—as though in two concentric circles—revolves around the unification of Germany and the unification of Europe, the initial momentum, the Archimedes' lever, which recently overturned the entire postwar confrontational but in a way stable European world disappears. The lever was in Moscow. And so far as the elimination of the division of Germany was concerned, it was brought into play by accident, as it were. The division of Germany and the division of Europe had perestroika in the Soviet Union as the precondition for their current movement toward their goal. The movement itself, covert until last fall's events, began when the Soviet leadership abolished the so-called "Brezhnev doctrine"—the right to Soviet armed interference in other socialist countries' affairs for the sake of preserving socialist gains and the socialist community itself. (That sentence should have contained a host of quotation marks, but I do not use them in order to reproduce the style of the past.) The aforementioned doctrine, even before it had received its Western-dubbed name, was applied for the first time in Hungary in 1956 and for the last time in Afghanistan in 1979-1989—a preventive measure, as it were, in order to defend future socialist values, which simply never materialized on Afghan soil.

Under Brezhnev the doctrine ensured a linkup between and the joint survival of authoritarian regimes politically similar to Brezhnev's regime in the USSR. When perestroika and the Soviet Union's move toward democracy began, the new Soviet leadership, cleaving to principles of noninterference, could not and did not set the aim of synchronizing the processes of perestroika in all European socialist countries. The principle of freedom of choice was put forward as the fundamental principle. At first it quite suited the then-leaders of the countries of East Europe since it preserved their power, as it were. The "older brother's" uncoupling from the regimes of the "younger brothers" left over from Brezhnev's day at first prolonged the political life of Honecker, Ceausescu, Zhivkov, and Husak. But it doomed them in the event of an activation of democratic movements, since the principle of freedom of choice was the other (main!) side of the rejection of the "Brezhnev doctrine." The doomed nature of authoritarian regimes finds expression in the fact that they are as incapable of foresight as they are of self-development. They realize their fate only in retrospect. When it is too late. The most striking example of

this was Ceausescu, who understood nothing until the very end, which proved to be abrupt and brutal.

Honecker, lost in dreams of Brezhnev's time, also did not understand. When a mass demonstration by many thousands of people demanding democracy was held in Leipzig 8 October 1989, Honecker issued a directive declaring its participants to be enemies and demanding that the forces of law and order mete out the appropriate treatment to them. During our discussion V.I. Kochemasov, Soviet ambassador to the GDR, mentioned that he had seen this directive. It was not carried out. Not only because the forces of law and order refused to carry out reprisals against the people. Their behavior was in many respects predetermined by the categorical policy of non-interference in the republic's internal affairs adopted by the Soviet troops stationed on its territory.

V.I. Kochemasov said that back on 8 October, using his rights as the Soviet leadership's plenipotentiary representative, he sent Army General Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, instructions not to interfere under any circumstances in events and, more specifically, for troop units to remain in their garrisons and take no part in any military exercises and for servicemen and members of their families not to leave the military camps. That sealed the fate of the Berlin wall and began the chain reaction of overcoming Germany's division.

The new political structures have not yet taken shape in East Europe, but already you cannot describe them as similar to ours. Although the Soviet Union is also undergoing a process of rapid change, the Communist Party is still in power, which cannot be said of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Romania. A situation similar to ours persists only in Bulgaria. Whereas in recent years the Soviet leadership had internally uncoupled itself from the ruling authoritarian regimes while, however, preserving quite firm community within the Warsaw Pact framework, no ideological kinship can as yet be seen with the new governments and nothing but outward diplomatic decorum remains of Warsaw Pact cooperation—despite the new governments' desire to have normal, full-blooded relations with the USSR. The political common ground consists above all in the fact that we are not impeding their "return to Europe," the establishment of independent ties with the West, and even their reorientation toward the West, which in itself bids farewell to the concept of the socialist community.

The former socialist countries' armies have ceased or are ceasing to be allied armies. Soviet troops are being withdrawn from Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and dates are being pondered for their withdrawal from Poland. NATO is not obliged to reciprocate in kind to this "unilateral," "internal" Warsaw Pact affair and as yet refuses to do so. The powerful Soviet troop grouping in the GDR (roughly 360,000 servicemen) remains and is maintaining the level of combat readiness that I saw when I visited the Uralsk-Lvov Tank Division—callow

youths were taking formidable T-80's out on four-day exercises. But the GDR Army has lost combat capability, the commanders—who are communists—are in confusion, if not despair, and Rainer Eppelmann, a well-known pacifist from the "Democratic Awakening" organization, has been appointed the new minister of disarmament and defense (that is what the Defense Ministry is called now) and has announced plans for radical cuts in the armed forces. Cases of desertion have increased in frequency and deserters are now being admitted to the Bundeswehr, which is, judging by authoritative assessments, still in good shape, although the "enemy image" has faded for its soldiers, too.

In Bad Marienburg, the old spa town a few dozen kilometers from Bonn, we took part in a seminar for Bundeswehr officers and sergeant majors conducted by the "House of Europe"—a public organization that exists in many countries and inspires the idea of European unity in its audiences. Young people in light blue military shirts sitting side by side at tables asked "uncouth" questions: They asked point-blank: "When will Poland return German territories?"—provoking a pedagogical rebuff from the director of the Bad Marienburg "House of Europe" and prompting the thought that the lessons of the war do not automatically apply to young people. Another question—from a German sergeant major—also took us aback: "Where is your national pride, Russians? You used to be strong, but now you are seeking Western aid." Yes, it is customary for us Russians to dash from one extreme to another, we also beg now sometimes, every little helps. While I was present, a dozen heavy trucks with trailers carrying children's clothing and footwear, special detergents for the miners, and various canned products set out from the Ruhr to the Kuzbass under our newspaper's sponsorship. Signs of compassion from the former vanquished, from the prosperous Germans...

I am citing these diverse facts in order to raise the direct question which was asked not only by the young German in military uniform: What does this mean for our position in the world—and at home? Has the Soviet Union ceased to be a great power? Not in terms of military might—nuclear and conventional—although we have renounced our fantastically stupid and even more ruinous strategy of equality with the rest of the world and our military might will decline with the reductions in military spending and the extension of conversion. We are certainly no longer the great power we were if you take our ability to inspire fear and at the same time an exaggerated idea of our own might. Our influence has certainly decreased outside our own territory, in Eastern Europe, which was a sphere of Soviet influence and dominance.

But to these questions troubling the public mind—as far as I can tell from readers' letters—we must add another, most important one: Can a power be truly great if its people do not lead a free and prosperous life? Without an efficient economy and a firm, attractive national currency?—after all, GDR Germans are above all fleeing

toward the FRG mark and Eastern Europe is also running as fast as it can from our ruble. A power without a good, worthy life for its people can only be an imperial power—by ruining itself with military spending and various kinds of historically untenable “missions” abroad. An imperial power with a peculiar inferiority complex over its intrinsically negligible leaders bedecked with awards and heaped with eulogies. We worked toward this false greatness for decades, not counting the cost, seeing the succeeding generations as nothing but construction material, and this inhuman attitude to human life was justified only insofar as the people retained their belief that a glorious future would dawn tomorrow and their artless belief that today we present an attractive example for many others in the world. Only the last of the Mohicans still retain their belief in the Messianic mission, and the example turned out to be not attractive but repellent. The people’s dignity has been humiliated by the lowest standard of living in an industrial country and the oppressive domination of the bureaucracy, which has worn once hallowed words threadbare with overuse.

Was such greatness necessary? And was it greatness? Glasnost has provided the answers. But we still quail at telling some truths. The main one being: We must now seek—and are already doing so—a more realistic and hence more modest niche in the world. Klyuchevskiy, who is still renowned, voiced the idea, I recall, that the Russian people’s freedom—as their history has proved—was inversely proportional to the expansion of Russia’s territorial possessions and influence. We must now concentrate on ensuring people’s freedom and a worthy standard of living, having overcome the last attack of Russian Messianism, which came in the form of dreams of world revolution and communist heaven on earth.

We are seeking a more realistic and, I suppose, modest place in the world, no longer pitting ourselves against the West but uniting with it in acknowledging the values of common human civilization. This is a path along which we are now being carried by common sense and a hard-won sense of realism. People in the West welcome this not through altruism and increased humanity but out of considerations of enlightened egoism, understanding of their own benefit, and the sober calculation that, with today’s high technology, there is sufficient place in the sun for everyone, although it will not shine equally on everyone. Broad pragmatic considerations are gaining the upper hand over narrow ideology among Western leaders. However much Bush, Kohl, Thatcher, and Mitterrand sympathize with the principle of Lithuanian independence, in the present circumstances they are making a cool pragmatic choice against hasty rash actions which would rock Soviet perestroika, which already has more than enough problems. At this promising and alarming historical moment, they do not want an unstable Soviet Union because this would lessen the hopes of a united Europe, within whose framework there will, incidentally, be a new European power—a united Germany.

East Bloc Refuses To Supply Currency for Rubles

PM0105153190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Apr 90 Second Edition p 7

[Feature by S. Cheremin under the “From Authoritative Sources” rubric comprising readers’ letters and commentary from N. Sviridov, deputy chief of department at USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity: “Has the Currency Gone Missing?”]

[Text] I received an invitation to go to Czechoslovakia. The documents were prepared quickly, but at the bank in Rostov-na-Donu I and some other oblast residents were told that there was no Czech and Slovak Federative Republic [CSFR] or Hungarian currency to exchange for rubles. Would you explain what has happened.

[Signed] V. Subbotin, Novocherkassk.

East European countries’ banks have stopped Soviet citizens exchanging 30 rubles for national currencies. Why is that?

[Signed] D. Petruk.

We asked N. Sviridov, department deputy chief at the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, to comment on these letters.

[Sviridov] Soviet citizens traveling abroad can exchange rubles for East European countries’ currencies if they are obtainable from the banks of those states. At the moment there are neither Hungarian forints nor Czechoslovak korunas in the USSR (the situation with other currencies is not as tight at the moment). This is due to Czechoslovakia’s and Hungary’s refusal to sell us their currencies for transfer rubles. As an alternative, forints and korunas are offered to us for freely convertible currency or in exchange for extra deliveries of raw materials or goods in excess of the established quotas.

Why do our neighbors adopt this stance? The point is that there is an imbalance in trade and payments between the USSR and the East European countries at the moment. Nonequivalent exchange of goods and services within the CEMA framework, which was carried out in transfer rubles when prices as a rule did not correspond to world prices, resulted in our being indebted to a number of East European states (if the payments had been made in convertible currency the situation would have been exactly the opposite). In refusing to sell us their currency our neighbors argue that they do not want to increase the USSR’s indebtedness in transfer rubles, because it is practically impossible to buy anything with them.

Bilateral talks are currently being held on the whole range of questions connected with payments for goods and services. In particular, the problem of providing citizens traveling abroad with currency is being considered. By and large, our prosperity in the currency sphere depends on the overall state of the economy, on Soviet products’ competitiveness on the international market. At the moment the only sensible thing to do is to switch to freely convertible currency. Then people traveling to

East European countries would be on equal terms with those traveling to capitalist countries and would pay for foreign currency in rubles at a higher rate.

As for the exchange of R30, it has been stopped by mutual agreement between the countries' banks. This is due to the gross speculation in Soviet currency abroad, since many USSR citizens have smuggled out sums considerably in excess of the set norm.

Economic Expert Queried on CEMA Transformation

*LD2904132690 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 0630 GMT 29 Apr 90*

[Text] [Presenter] Our Moscow correspondent Gabor Izbegi has interviewed the deputy director of the Bogomolov Institute:

[Izbergi] The CEMA is needed now so that, with its help, the former East European practice of cooperation, built on political priorities, may be gradually dismantled. This is the opinion which was expressed about the organization's present and future—to my knowledge similarly to several of his colleagues at the Institute—by Aleksandr Nikitelov one of the deputies of Academician Bogomolov, who heads the institute:

[Begin Nikitelov recording in Russian fading into reporter's Hungarian translation] The most important change that has already taken place is that by now not a single member state talks about the deepening of the integration processes. There is not even any need for this; this has lost its topicality. Of course, integration has not been achieved even up to now. Also no longer topical is the plan which two years ago was still spoken of as a novelty, to set up an East European common market. After all, everybody, including the Soviet Union, wants to join Western Europe, the whole world economy. [end recording]

[Izbergi] Well then, just what is topical? Is it what they talked about first of all, that the organization should take on a consultative role, or that it should completely disappear, I asked:

[Begin Nikitelov recording] When we speak about the CEMA's transformation we are inclined to forget what kind of role this organization played in the past. We mysticize its significance, whereas the CEMA was by no means as important a factor as we now make out. We say that from multilateral cooperation we must go over to bilateral. That is all well and good. But there never has been an kind of multilateral cooperation here. That was precisely one of CEMA's big failings.

The task of radically transforming CEMA and the forms of cooperation in the near future is hardly achievable. Well, I do not say this because I am against change. Quite the opposite, but rather because the member states do not have the internal economic conditions for this. From past statements for example, it transpires that it is

mainly the small East European states which are interested in maintaining the form of cooperation within CEMA, precisely so that in this way they might ensure the possibility of a gradual dismantling, and for their own gradual transformation they might get outside guarantees.

The immediate halting of the practice that has evolved within CEMA and the rapid dismantling of the old structure would bring about grave economic harm, upsetting the balance, and in the end it would lead to great social tension. [end recording]

[Izbergi] Even so, what happens if someone leaves the organization because in the meantime the situation is changing, I asked:

[Begin Nikitelov recording] If somebody leaves then henceforth he will have to solve every problem himself. It is true, of course, that even up to now states have been concluding bilateral agreements. However, now the point is that no small country wants to allow the other to achieve more favorable conditions during negotiations with the Soviet Union than itself. For this reason it has an interest in seeing that the prices, the methods of accounting and many more, so to speak, rules of the game are created jointly and with the same validity for every small country.

I stress once again, CEMA must not be mysticized. Many people say that CEMA is an obstacle to progress; for this reason one has to leave it, it has to be abolished. In reality, however, the obstacle to the East European countries' internal economic development, or the development of wide-ranging international business relations, is not CEMA but the economic model shaped by our systems, which does not change by any means as fast as we would like. In my view, CEMA is in no way an obstacle, for example, to any member state changing its foreign economic orientation. Let us recognize that CEMA is a weak organization and always has been. It is much too weak to have been able, or to be able now, to obstruct anybody's step in this direction. [end recording]

[Izbergi] In that case at least its name should be changed, so that it should not remind us of the past. Or is this also a matter of indifference, I asked.

[Begin Nikitelov recording] Essentially, yes, just as it is also nonessential whether there will be 30-40, or even 200, fewer staff members in the Moscow headquarters. A characteristic example is that new GDR head of government has also alluded to the fact that even in spite of German unification they do not wish to leave CEMA, because they need the system of relations that have been created within it. [end recording]

West Europe**Yeltsin Continues Convalescence in Barcelona****Recovers After Spinal Disc Surgery**

*LD0205133490 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish
1200 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] The Soviet deputy, Boris Yeltsin, is recovering in Barcelona from his spinal disc operation. He expressed his gratitude to the doctors in the universal language of signs, with a V for victory, and two kisses on the cheek for his doctor. (Adolf Vito) reports:

[Vito] The radical Soviet deputy, Boris Yeltsin, has already recovered 90 per cent of the motor function of the leg affected by the slipped disc for which he underwent an operation on Monday night in Barcelona. Yeltsin took his first steps around the room this morning free from tubes, drips and pain. He expressed his satisfaction to the surgeon, (Jose Llovert) in Soviet fashion.

[Llovert] When he got off the bed and found he was standing up and felt so well he made the victory sign, giving the thumbs up, and I think that following Soviet custom he came up to me and gave me two kisses on the cheeks and said "gracias."

[Vito] In the next few hours Boris Yeltsin will regain the remaining 10 percent motor function and will be discharged from hospital tomorrow or Friday.

Cited on 'Future President' Role

*AU0105144990 Paris AFP in English 1433 GMT
1 May 90*

[Excerpt] Barcelona, Spain, May 1 (AFP)—Soviet radical deputy Boris Yeltsin is making a "surprising" recovery after emergency surgery Monday night for a herniated disc and can return home in three or four days, doctors said Tuesday. Mr. Yeltsin was admitted to a Barcelona hospital on Monday after complaining of back pain that paralysed his right foot. Doctors said the pain had now "disappeared".

Doctor Josep Llovet said he was in good spirits and joking that the operation had been necessary because "a future president of the Soviet Union must not have a paralyzed foot". Dr. Llovet said Mr. Yeltsin could start to walk again on Wednesday, and head back to Moscow in three or four days, if there were no complications. But he expected the deputy's complete recovery from the hour-and-a-half operation, without which there might have been complete paralysis of the right foot. [passage omitted]

Comments on Anti-Gorbachev Protest

*LD0205195690 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish
1800 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] One of the fiercest critics of Gorbachev's reforms continues to be Boris Yeltsin, who is now convalescing at

a Barcelona clinic, although this afternoon he had time to receive a number of journalists, among them our colleague Ernest Blanc:

[Blanc] Admitted to a Barcelona hospital, Boris Yeltsin appeared this afternoon before the television cameras in order to scotch the rumors about his health. Moreover, Boris Yeltsin explained that, in his opinion, the protests staged against Gorbachev in Red Square yesterday by a number of groups of demonstrators are due to the lack of strategy with which the Soviet leader is carrying forward the political reforms known as perestroika. The radical reformist leader Boris Yeltsin accused Mikhail Gorbachev of being radical in the application of perestroika. [sentence as heard] Gorbachev is not doing enough; he has too many commitments and intends to take advantage of the people, whom he hopes will wait another 70 years.

Yeltsin Calls Lithuanian Blockade 'Gross' Mistake

*LD2904003690 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish
2200 GMT 28 Apr 90*

[Text] [First announcer] The Soviet reformist leader Boris Yeltsin is in Cordoba, where he has been taking part in the Second International Conference on Urban Development being held in that city.

[Second announcer] In his speech he said that the bad economic situation and cheap currency impede Soviet entry into the European market. As for the situation in Lithuania, he said that he does not support the system of economic blockade, and that he considers it to be one of Gorbachev's great, gross mistakes.

Yeltsin Repeats Call for 'Radical Measures'

*PM3004152890 London DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 28 Apr 90 p 9*

[Anton La Guardia report: "Yeltsin Urges Action To Avoid Revolution"]

[Text] The leading Soviet radical, Mr. Boris Yeltsin, delivered another ominous warning to President Gorbachev yesterday. Speaking in London after meeting Mrs. Thatcher, the former Moscow party chief assailed the Kremlin's handling of the Lithuanian crisis, the fall in Soviet living standards and the failure of economic reforms.

"The road of half-measures and compromises, which has been followed for the last five years, leads to a dead end," he said. "We need radical measures, not just cosmetic, painting the facade of the building."

With characteristic bluntness, he said: "There must be improvements within the next few months if we are not to have a revolutionary rise from the grass roots. This could come this year."

Downing Street described his encounter with Mrs. Thatcher as "friendly." But in a hint of rebuke to Mr. Yeltsin, she declared herself to be a "great supporter" of Mr. Gorbachev.

"The Kremlin leader's policies, Mrs. Thatcher said, were "historic and have opened a new era in East-West relations." She said Britain felt a "special affinity for Mr. Gorbachev and his reforms" because he had visited London before becoming the party leader.

Mr. Yeltsin, who is in London to promote his autobiography "Against the Grain", has deposited about 250,000 pounds in royalties from the book with Barclays Bank. Total royalties from worldwide sales are expected to reach 1 million pounds, and Mr. Yeltsin said the money would be used to fight Aids in the Soviet Union.

He proposed greater freedom for Soviet enterprises, enabling them to negotiate joint ventures with the West, and said Soviet industrial production was falling while wages were rising rapidly.

"The general result is a drop in living standards, the speeding up of inflation (and) continuing difficulties in the supply of basic foodstuffs and consumer goods," he said.

He also criticised Mr. Gorbachev for imposing an economic boycott against Lithuania, which has declared its independence from the Soviet Union.

"We are talking about our people, our republic, people who were born in the Soviet Union," he said, adding: "It is not a solution to blockade the population."

Yeltsin Grants Television Interview in London

*PM0105153490 London ITV Television Network
in English 1210 GMT 29 Apr 90*

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Boris Yeltsin in Russian with superimposed English translation by reporter Trevor Phillips on 27 April in London on ITV's "Eyewitness" program—recorded]

[Text] [Phillips] Mr. Yeltsin speaks no English and, given his experience with the Soviet media, is understandably suspicious of being interviewed at all—never mind in a foreign language. However, on Friday, with the aid of two interpreters, he agreed to talk in London. Mr. Yeltsin, do you think that Mr. Gorbachev's position is in any danger?

[Yeltsin] No, I don't want him to fall, although I don't support his methods and tactics of perestroika. I want him to be more radical about reforms of economy, about perestroika, about the welfare of the Soviet people: And because of this, I protest. I don't want a catastrophe that can touch not only our country but other countries of the world. I want perestroika, which has got stuck, to get out of the crises in this year. Surely this year will be the most decisive one, and if there isn't any improvement, we will face people's mistrust this year.

[Phillips] In what circumstances would Gorbachev, in your view, be removed: What would you be warning him about in this critical year?

[Yeltsin] Why are all the questions about Gorbachev? Do you think that among 280 million of Soviet people, there is no alternative to Gorbachev? If you say this, it is an offense to the people.

[Phillips] Would the alternative possibly be Boris Yeltsin?

[Yeltsin] When I'm asked this question, I consider it a provocation against me.

[Phillips] Oh, I'm sorry. I'm trying to find out.

[Yeltsin] I understand, I understand: That's why I answered this way.

[Phillips] Let me turn to an important current question: Would you be prepared to accept a Lithuania which was in sole charge of its own defense and its own foreign policy—which is what one would define as a truly independent nation?

[Yeltsin] We have it written in the Constitution that each republic has the right of self-determination, including the right to leave the Union. The Union is voluntary. Lithuania is now able to really leave the USSR and become a sovereign state: This is its right, and I acknowledge this right. I see this possibility in reality concerning not only Lithuania.

[Phillips] Could you see a Soviet Union where Estonia, Latvia, Georgia, Ukraine seceded? Perhaps you were left with just a Russian Republic: Could you see that happening?

[Yeltsin] I can ask you just the opposite question. Can you imagine the Soviet Union left by the Russian Republic?

[Phillips] It would be a completely different union: It would be no union, perhaps.

[Yeltsin] But Russia also has a right to separate; it does have a right, and if Russia is treated the way it is being treated—that is, robbed by the other republics—now it can consider using this right the same way that Lithuania did. Answering your question, I think I can see three Baltic republics separated and possibly Moldavia and Georgia.

[Phillips] Do you think those five will leave?

[Yeltsin] Though I'm not a prophet, I think it is possible, I think it is quite possible.

[Phillips] If they did leave the Union, what effect would it have on the rest of the Soviet Union?

[Yeltsin] Oh, it would have rather serious results. If they had seceded in 1925 it would have been much easier, because at that time there were no economical and other links between republics.

[Phillips] You spoke earlier about the possibility that Russia could secede. If you... would you be prepared in any circumstances to lead Russia out of the Soviet Union?

[Yeltsin] No, I would not do this: I would fight for maximum independence, for complete decentralization of the economy, politics, finance, national relationship, social aspects, etc. I talked to Margaret Thatcher about this today. I asked her: Could you sign a treaty with Russia when Russia is independent within the USSR—about economical, scientific, cultural cooperation, about trade, etcetera, since people have the right to sign such a treaty? She said she would like to see what kind of independence Russia would have under the new law: That is not a refusal.

[Phillips] May I move on to economics? The single most important reform that Mr. Gorbachev has not implemented is price reform. Now would you...

[Yeltsin interrupts] Oh, you're mistaken. It's far from being the only thing he hadn't done or had done in a wrong way.

[Phillips] Look, I know you have many criticisms, but let's deal with this particular one: Would you, in his position, be prepared to remove state subsidies on housing and food?

[Yeltsin] No.

[Phillips] Why not?

[Yeltsin] No, I would ask the people; I would tell them all the truth about the crisis, about the way we're moving. I would tell them: "Let's have a referendum." People should have their say.

[Phillips] Ah, but the people would be looking to... for leadership. They would say: "But Boris, tell us, what is your opinion, what is your program?"

[Yeltsin] I just say I support the mixed economy, the market economy. I support complete independence for the enterprises; I support a complex of different forms of ownership, including private ownership. But in our country they're afraid of the word "private."

[Phillips] Mr. Yeltsin, all that you've just said would not be at all surprising if it came from the lips of Margaret Thatcher. If Vladimir Lenin was sitting here listening to you, do you believe—because I don't—that he would say that this is the kind of Soviet Union he had in mind? He would say: "You're not a Communist; you're no longer one of us."

[Yeltsin] No, he wouldn't recognize the Soviet Union. He envisaged it in a different way. Of course, Lenin was

quite flexible. He could change decisions depending on circumstances, and within 70 years he could have made changes definitely more than once: He was against monopoly of the party.

[Phillips] Are you trying to tell me that Lenin would be in favor of a multiparty democracy today?

[Yeltsin] It's hard to say, but I think he would have had a much better kind of perestroika organized within 70 years than our leader has done. Today, I support the Democratic Platform as a movement inside the Communist Party: I share its position. I'll wait for the 28th Congress of the Communist Party: If the Congress decides to renew the party and allows different movements to exist inside the Communist Party, we will do so. But if the Congress doesn't, we will have to break away from the Communist Party and form our own party.

British-Soviet Friendship Society Convenes

PM0205145790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent A. Lyutyy: "Loyalty to Traditions"]

[Text] London, 1 May—A two-day conference of the British-Soviet Friendship Society has been held in London.

The debates reflected no complacency and unanimity, and the emotional disputes in many ways reflected the complex processes now taking place in our own country.

The society has existed in Britain since 1946. Now uniting, in addition to collective members, about 3,000 people, it has absorbed the Soviet land's true well-wishers, those tested by time, not brought on the crest of considerations of expediency. It is not easy for all of them to understand the processes taking place in our country. Some things are accepted unreservedly and enthusiastically, others are disputed. But there remains devotion to friendship with the USSR.

"Yes, our organization has urgent problems," I was told by Anthony Charter, member of the society's executive committee. "One of the main ones is the aging of its membership and a certain closed nature. Few young people come to us. Not because they are indifferent toward the Soviet Union. It is simply that in recent years young people in Britain have in general displayed little interest in political organizations. One more problem is the lack of money."

The society's leading organs were elected at the conference. The senior British communist Andrew Rothstein remained as president and William Wilson as chairman. A program for cooperation for the next two years was signed with the "USSR-Great Britain" association. Within its framework reciprocal trips, exchanges between people, and links between twinned cities will be activated.

Soviet 'Circles' on Alignment of United Germany

LD0305093990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0800 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 3 May (TASS)—Next Saturday the first meeting of the foreign ministers of the FRG, the GDR, and also of the countries which were allies in the anti-Hitlerite coalition—the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, and France—will take place in Bonn within the framework of the "two plus four" mechanism, which was created for discussing problems of the unification of the two German states.

Various aspects of this question—internal, international, military-political—are being examined actively in NATO, "the Common Market," and the Warsaw Treaty organizations. The most important factor of this process is, as has been noted by many statesmen of countries of West and East Europe, the military-political status of a United Germany. The Soviet Union, in particular, advocates that in the process of unification the balance that has come about on the continent should be preserved. In a recent interview to the Irish news agency "IRISH TIMES" USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze noted that such an aim "is fully achievable. Germany becomes a state that is unaligned militarily, whose armed forces would have a potential sufficient only for defense purposes."

Linking the movement toward a United Germany with efforts to create all-European security structures can serve as an important guarantee for maintaining stability, in the Soviet side's view.

In any case, it is noted in Soviet diplomatic circles, participation in NATO by a United Germany is unacceptable for the USSR, as that would mean the current balance of forces in Europe being radically upset. In this connection the unconventional idea of dual NATO and Warsaw Treaty Organization membership of the future German state is being voiced. Dual membership could become a practical step toward creating all-European security structures and the territory of Germany would be turned into a "proving ground" for constructive interaction between the blocs, would become a location for their gradual diffusion.

Touching on the operation of the "two plus four" mechanism, the USSR shares the approach of those states which believe that the results of the work of the "Six" should be examined at a summit meeting of the member countries of the European Security and Cooperation Conference and, possibly, be approved by them. Such an approach would assist the interests of Germany's neighbors, both in East and West, being observed.

Petrovskiy Meets WEU Secretary General

PM0205150390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Apr 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] The USSR Foreign Ministry has established contacts with the WEU [Western European Union]—a military-political organization which has appreciably increased its role in European affairs of late.

V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, received this organization's secretary general, W. van Eekelen, who is paying an unofficial visit to Moscow, 28 April.

While discussing the problem of strengthening security and stability on the European continent, both sides emphasized the external aspects of the process of German unification and questions linked with the convocation of a CSCE summit meeting in 1990 and the creation of all-European structures of security and cooperation, along with problems of cutting back armed forces and arms in Europe. They reached agreement on establishing regular exchanges of opinions.

Latin America & Caribbean

'Encouraging Signs' in Central America Noted

PM2704160690 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Commentary by Colonel V. Lutskevich, candidate of economic sciences, under the rubric "International Notes": "A Chance For Central America"]

[Excerpts] In Nicaragua the Sandinist National Liberation Front handed over power as planned on 25 April to the National Opposition Union, which won the February elections. This act not only continues the complex process of the political resolution of the problems caused by the country's nine-year war, but also signifies a new stage in the peaceful settlement of the whole Central American conflict. [passage omitted].

Despite the complicated conditions of the struggle against the Contras, the Sandinistas implemented major social reforms and furthered the development of democratic principles in society's life. Honestly carrying out the will of the majority of the voters, they handed over power to the opposition, which won by free and democratic elections.

As regards El Salvador, there is no letup there in the battles between the government army and detachments of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front [FMLN]. The situation remains unstable in Guatemala too, where around 4,000 guerrillas of the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity [URNG] are resisting the government army. Lately, however, encouraging signs of changes for the better have appeared even in these countries. Meetings between representatives of the Guatemalan Government and the URNG, and of the Salvadoran Government and the FMLN, took place in March and April in Oslo and Geneva. They ended in the reaching of agreements on future talks aimed at resolving questions of ending military actions and searching for mutually acceptable ways of settling the prolonged conflicts peacefully.

It is hard to predict how successful the new round of talks between the warring sides will be and what results it will lead to. For in the past similar meetings have repeatedly ended not in peace but in a resumption of hostilities. But there is still one fundamental difference from the past—the practical example of the implementation of a peaceful settlement plan in Nicaragua. Utilizing this experience while taking into account the specific conditions in each country will pave the way toward establishing a really solid and lasting peace in Central America.

Baklanov Leads Delegation to Cuba

*LD0305094490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0900 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Baklanov, USSR people's deputy and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Havana today at the invitation of the National Assembly of the People's Government of the Republic of Cuba.

Reportage on Cuba's Rosales Visit to USSR

Meets With Moiseyev

*PM2504085790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 21 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Division General Ulises Rosales del Toro, candidate member of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee Politburo, first vice minister of the republic's Revolutionary Armed Forces, and chief of the General Staff, who is on an official visit to the USSR, laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum on 20 April. He also laid a wreath on the Grave of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

On the same day Division General Ulises Rosales del Toro met with Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister. A conversation took place in which questions of common interest were discussed.

In the afternoon Division General Ulises Rosales visited the M.V. Frunze Military Academy.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev gave a dinner in the Cuban guest's honor.

Visits Tank Unit; Departs

*PM2504102790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 Apr 90 First Edition p 3*

[Unattributed report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Division General Ulises Rosales del Toro, candidate member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, first deputy minister of the republic's Revolutionary Armed Forces, and chief of the

Revolutionary Armed Forces General Staff, who was on an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, visited the Kantemir Guards Tank Division 22 April. The Cuban guest was accompanied by Army General M.A. Moiseyev.

On the same day Division General U. Rosales del Toro and the persons accompanying him left the USSR. He was seen off at the airport by Army General M.A. Moiseyev and other officials. The sendoff party included Carlos Trejo Sosa, Cuban charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, and Colonel Ricardo Hernandez Merino, military attache at the Cuban Embassy in the USSR.

Cuba's 'Alarming Situation' Examined

*LD0305080690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0430 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] An alarming situation has arisen these days around Cuba. The Caribbean Basin has become a region of major exercises of the U.S. Armed Forces. Additional equipment has been transferred to the Guantanamo base which the United States maintains on Cuba. The strategic exercises envisage working under combat conditions of a global nuclear conflict. Viktor Gorbachev, our correspondent, tells how these exercises are being assessed in Cuba.

[Gorbachev] In the course of similar maneuvers last May the U.S. Air Force carried out a dummy mass attack on Cuba. On the American continent Cuba has again become the only state which the Washington administration considers its enemy. Successes in Panama and Nicaragua [words indistinct]. Therefore, these days, when the United States is holding maneuvers in the vicinity of Cuba with the participation of hundreds of aeroplanes, dozens of ships and major military units, the revolutionary armed forces are forced to take additional defense measures to avert a surprise attack.

Cuban Troops Continue Withdrawal From Angola

*LD0305080790 Moscow TASS in English
0627 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] Havana May 3 TASS—A total of 33,048 Cuban troops have been withdrawn from Angola under the agreements signed in New York in December 1983, the Ministry of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces said in a statement issued here. Eight hundred and thirty one Cuban soliders returned home in April.

The Cuban troops are leaving Angola a month behind schedule because of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] provocations which stopped the withdrawal from January 25 to February 24, the statement says.

The return of Cuban troops is being supervised by the UN mission in Angola, the statement stresses.

Cuban Military Defense Exercises Reported

LD0305084990 Moscow TASS in English
0816 GMT 3 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kulikov]

[Text] Havana May 3 TASS—Thousands of people are taking part in Cuban military exercises, codenamed "Cuban Shield," which began on Wednesday.

The exercises involve, besides regular army units, territorial emergency volunteer corps and the so-called production-and-defence brigades set up in labour collectives.

The centenary of the Mayday holiday was celebrated in Cuba under the slogans of "Work for socialism together with the party and Fidel" and "Total dedication to labour and defence." On the evening of the same day television announced the beginning of the exercises and broadcast an interview of Fidel Castro with foreign correspondents.

In the interview, Castro said that, faced with the mounting external threat to socialist gains in the republic, its leaders "are taking necessary measures to stop any attempt at a surprise attack."

It is not concealed here that the current exercises are being held in response to the build-up by the United States of its military presence in the Caribbean and its military manoeuvres in that region.

A recent statement by the Cuban Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces points out that the Pentagon scheduled three military games for the beginning of May, one of which, code named "Defex," will take place at the U.S. naval base in Guantanamo, located on Cuban territory.

The "Global Shield" manoeuvres, involving the 82nd paratroop division of the U.S. Army, which gained notoriety as the major strike force during the American invasion of Grenada and Panama, generates particular concern. On some days, these manoeuvres will be held close to Cuban territory.

All units of the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces were put on high alert on the occasion of the "Cuban Shield" exercises. Various arms of the service and emergency volunteer corps began practising their ability to work smoothly to repulse an attack.

Transfer of Power in Nicaragua Viewed

PM0305094990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Yevg. Bay in Moscow and A. Korzin in Managua: "Nicaragua: New Government in Office"]

[Text] Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, the new president of Nicaragua, has announced the formation of her 10-member cabinet. It includes well-known figures from

UNO [National Opposition Union] and prominent lawyers and economists. Carlos Hurtado Cabrera, a major trade union figure, is appointed to the post of minister of the interior and Silvio de Franco Montalban heads the Ministry of the Economy and Development.

Right up until 25 April skeptics had considerable grounds for doubting the readiness of the FSLN [Sandinist National Liberation Front] to hand over power in a peaceful and well-organized way, as the Sandinist leaders had repeatedly said they would. But their skepticism proved unfounded. At the inauguration ceremony held in the national stadium in Managua, the blue and white—the colors of the national flag—presidential mantle was ideally suited to the elegant snow-white suit of the first woman president of Nicaragua, with her noble bearing and gray hair.

The road traveled by Nicaragua over the past two months was not easy. Clashes between FSLN supporters and those of the UNO opposition alliance, which won the election, started occurring everywhere. The Sandinists handed out weapons to their supporters in the cities and countryside, while numerous Contra detachments infiltrated Nicaraguan territory. Denunciations in the newspaper LA PRENSA (owned by the new president) of certain Sandinist officials who had grabbed state property "before the final curtain" inflamed the situation. Finally, the wave of strikes organized by the leaders of the Sandinist working people's trade union center threatened to turn into a national strike.

The passions that raged during the transitional period also overwhelmed the stands of the national stadium during the ceremony of the transfer of power. The organizers' decision to seat Sandinist and UNO supporters in different sections turned out to be very appropriate. When D. Ortega and his wife, mother, and children entered the stadium and made for the main rostrum, stones were thrown at him from the UNO section of the stadium. Violeta Barrios de Chamorro was "presented with" a barrage of water bombs—the security guards warded them off, causing a cloud of spray. The appearance of the U.S. delegation headed by Vice President D. Quayle was "greeted" with chants of "Murderers, murderers!" from the Sandinist section. When D. Ortega started to address the meeting—it was his last speech as the country's president—in response to his repeated question "Where are the Somoza Guards?" the Sandinist "fans" pointed to the UNO rostrum.

In her appeal to the nation after being sworn in V. Barrios de Chamorro promised to turn Nicaragua from "a source of discord in Central America into a factor of unity and conciliation." She announced priority measures aimed at stabilizing the situation in the country, overcoming the crisis, and ensuring national reconciliation. This primarily involved a general amnesty, the abolition of compulsory military service, a reduction in the army, a review of cases of the confiscation of property on political grounds, the restriction of state interference in the economy, and a free market.

The most delicate question in the changeover of power is the future of the Sandinist People's Army, which served as the prop of the regime for almost 11 years. Dona Violeta resolved the question as follows: Apart from the presidential functions and powers of high commander of the armed forces which the constitution bestows on her, she will personally carry out the duties of defense minister. The Sandinist H. Ortega will remain as army commander.

REUTER notes that the new president's decision with respect to H. Ortega provoked the displeasure of a number of hardliners within the UNO, as well as Contra leaders. As a special UNO communique says, "Chamorro will lose the support of parties in the alliance if she allows H. Ortega to remain in the post of commander." I. Galiano, one of the leaders of the still armed Contras, stated that the retention of H. Ortega as commander will be a stumbling block in fulfilling the accords on the disarmament of the rebels. Other commanders of Contra detachments followed his example and announced that they will not obey H. Ortega and will not lay down their arms while he is commander.

The decision adopted by the new president, REUTER comments, is one of the biggest compromises between the government and the left-wing Sandinists. Otherwise, V. Chamorro's closest advisers affirm, Nicaragua would slide into civil war again.

By taking charge of the Defense Ministry herself, Violeta Chamorro can ensure, in her words, "civilian control over the armed forces" and "will personally lead the demobilization of the Contras and part of the army, as well as the demilitarization of the country." As presidential adviser A. Cesar believes, H. Ortega may leave his post 10 June, when the two most important tasks are resolved—the disarmament of the Contras and the reduction of the 100,000-strong army.

In Washington the White House spokesman M. Fitzwater, stated that the United States must do all it can to help the new Nicaraguan Government.

Meanwhile, experts in the United States believe that even if the full promised \$300 million is provided, hard times await V. Chamorro's government. "The Sandinists decided to hold honest elections in order to avoid direct confrontation with the United States, but they will now do everything to lead from below," REUTER believes.

Contras 'Demand' Ortega Resignation

PM0205090790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 May 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent I. Pshenichnikov dispatch: "No Intention of Disarming. Reportage from the Contras General Staff"]

[Text] El Destino, 30 Apr—Apart from the patrols at numerous checkpoints, there are hardly any signs that one is approaching the General Staff of the "Nicaraguan

Resistance," located in the small town of El Destino in a mountainous and almost inaccessible region of Nueva Segovia Province in Northern Nicaragua. Only the faded khaki of combat blouses worn by fighters from the Sandinist People's Army is replaced by the contras' camouflage jackets, which often still carry "U.S. Army" tags.

Israel Galeano, commander in chief of the Nicaraguan Resistance, also known as "Comandante Franklin," began his conversation with the TASS correspondent with utmost determination: "We will not lay down our arms for as long as even a single Sandinist remains in command position in the army. First and foremost we demand General Umberto Ortega's resignation." This was the comment by the contras' military leader on the order he issued a few days ago forbidding resistance detachments on Nicaraguan territory to lay down their arms. This decision, at odds with the armed opposition leaders' pledge to begin disarming their formations 25 April, sharply exacerbated the situation in the country.

On the day of her inauguration as president, V. Barrios de Chamorro announced her decision to leave Army General Umberto Ortega as head of the Armed Forces "until the contras' complete demobilization and the completion of the process of army cutbacks."

The resistance detachments are at present assembling in five "security zones" established on Nicaraguan territory by the UN International Forces for the Maintenance of Peace in Latin America, I. Galeano said. At the same time, he noted, we reserve the right to come out of these zones and resume combat operations against the army if Nicaragua's new president fails to meet our demands for Umberto Ortega's resignation.

"If the armed opposition were to lay down its arms while Umberto Ortega remained in the army, this would mean admitting defeat," the TASS correspondent was told by Oscar Sobalvarro, one of the five members of the Nicaraguan Resistance General Staff. "We will hand over our arms only to the new government and not to the Sandinists, and only on condition that the new authorities create the necessary guarantees for the resistance fighters' safety."

People's Deputies Delegation Arrives in Barbados

LD2404163590 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT
24 Apr 90

[By TASS Special Correspondent Aleksandr Chernbov]

[Text] Bridgetown April 24 TASS—A group of Soviet people's deputies on a goodwill tour of the Caribbean countries arrived in Barbados.

The deputies met Barbados Foreign Minister Maurice King.

King said Barbados is interested in establishing commercial, cultural and scientific links with the Soviet Union.

"Despite the great distance that separates us we cannot remain indifferent to changes in the biggest country of the world and in East Europe," King said.

The visit is designed to establish direct links between the parliaments of the two countries, Soviet People's Deputy B. Miroshin said.

A few days earlier, the Soviet delegation visited the Bahamas and the Dominican Republic.

Soviet Parliamentary Delegation Visits Jamaica

*LD2704083390 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT
27 Apr 90*

[Text] Kingston April 27 TASS—A Soviet parliamentary delegation is completing its goodwill visit to Caribbean countries. The group of Soviet people's deputies, who arrived in Jamaica on Thursday, were met at the airport by Portia Simpson, minister of labour, social welfare and sports, who greeted them on behalf of the Jamaican Government.

At the Foreign Ministry the delegation met Minister of State Ben Clare. People's Deputy Boris Miroshin dwelt on Soviet reforms as well as social and political problems involving all regions of the USSR. Perestroyka, which began in the USSR and which was picked up by East Europe, found a warm response all over the world, including Jamaica, the minister of state said. "We are keeping a watchful eye over its implementation," he stressed.

Moreover, the changes that have become a reality in the Soviet Union, are also most directly affecting Caricom [Caribbean Community and Common Market] countries. Suffice it to say that the perestroyka-inspired appreciable progress in global disarmament enables developing countries, including Jamaica, to expect a rise in economic aid. This question is acquiring special significance in view of favourable possibilities of broader cooperation with the Soviet Union, he said.

The Soviet people's deputies will meet Jamaica's leaders in parliament today.

Supreme Soviet Session

Velikhov Outlines Scientific Work at Chernobyl

LD3004184590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1640 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Speech by Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov at USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow—live relay]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] In the past four years 130-150 scientists, depending on the time, members of the atomic energy institute, and 350 technical personnel together with a large group of builders have been inside the fourth unit [of Chernobyl], inside the cover, in order to determine the situation in the fourth unit itself.

The first task was to find out whether it was possible for a chain reaction to recur with the consequent danger of major radioactive contamination. I must tell you that as a result of a deep borehole that was made and observations inside the vessel in which the reactor had formerly existed in the past and the remnants of all of that, we are now firmly convinced and we have proved this—there is a report on this—that there is no such danger. However, there are two questions. Of course, the structures of the entire construction are in a poor state and recently—we have been doing this in virtually all of the areas around the reactor—we have managed to carry out a certification; we are continuing the certification and observation of the structures of the building within the sarcophagus. We shall continue to do this and continue the boring in order to fully determine what happened. This is important for understanding the accident and, most important for understanding what will happen in the future, and to draw up a plan of how to eliminate it. Because, as you understand, 97 percent of the radioactive fuel is still within the fourth unit and the sarcophagus.

The second problem we are working on is the problem of what to do with the contaminated territory within the 35 km zone where there are a large number of temporary burial areas and which we must work on again. This is also a major test which we shall tackle over the next five years. So, our efforts have not been reduced.

Those are the problems which are connected with the units themselves. As for the Chernobyl station, on the first two units, the first and the second which are first generation units and should be actually taken out of operation in a fairly short time, measures have been taken so that the Chernobyl type of accident cannot be repeated. I think that can be done at a more [word indistinct] commission. I have very little time. But this has been done. But since these units are first generation units, the solution which is proposed [word indistinct] we must now, and we are working on this, will work out a program for their withdrawal from use. [passage omitted]

Supreme Soviet Hears Report on Chernobyl

LD0205121890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1654 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Speech by Yuriy Antoniyevich Izrael, chairman of the State Hydrometeorology Committee, at 25 April Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow—from the recorded relay]

[Text] Esteemed comrade chairman, esteemed deputies. First of all, the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology fully supports the programs submitted for examination today, both the republican and the union ones. Insofar as it falls within the competence of the committee, the state committee has participated in the compilation of the union part and, naturally, in the republican ones to some extent, when they were being discussed.

I will later make a few remarks about the programs but most of all I would like to speak about several issues which have been raised today in connection with information about the radiation conditions which arose as a result of the tragedy of 26 April 1986. A few words about what the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology has done over the past year, since I spoke to you a year ago, taking into account the criticism and the instructions given to us, to the State Committee for Hydrometeorology.

We have issued maps—you have seen them in the foyer—and they have been published in the central press and in local newspapers. We have established a definite procedure by which this information comes in to the areas and to the local authorities, and it is published for the whole population. I would like to stress straight away that this information [changes thought] some in the press and some of what has been heard in speeches here has alleged that it has been altered. I would like to say that of course it has gained more and more in detail, since there has been time to take more detailed measurements, but I would like to stress again that as early as the beginning of May, the overall area, the overall contamination was determined using aeroplanes and helicopters, and this was published; and using isolines of 0.05 milliroentgens per hour it amounted to 200,00 square kilometers at the beginning of May. If today figures are to be heard for the area contaminated with caesium-137 upwards of one curie per square kilometer amounting to 100,000 sq.km, then you will see that this is approximately the same area as the area which was photographed as early as May 1986. This was more in order to determine what patches were where.

A little has been said here about zones of contamination on the territory of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], apart from Bryansk oblast. Yes, the information about Tula oblast, about the town of Plavsk, about Orel oblast and Kaluga oblast, was found out and was passed on. I will list shortly where it was passed on to, and we have spoken and written about this, as well. It was passed on to the operational group of the CPSU

Central Committee that was formed, to the government commission. It was passed on to the leadership of the RSFSR, to the leadership of Ukraine, to the leadership of Belorussia, and to all the ministries involved in eliminating the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station, and also to the local authorities.

Yes, indeed, there has been criticism of us as well, and I have spoken about this. Yes, indeed, this information, these maps were not published, for reasons which you know, in the newspapers. I will tell you the reasons: the population, for the most part, as far as this information is concerned, did have access to this information, if not in such detail as one could get from the map. You know that straight away, in May, and then a few months later, the population was accorded certain benefits, according to the criteria established of 15 curies for caesium, three curies for strontium and one tenth for plutonium.

You know that there are people who receive 100 percent, 75 percent, and 25 percent wage increments, to say nothing of the small sums which have been introduced for produce that is pure. What is the reason that this information failed to be published in the press? Immediately following the accident, there was a period when information was in the process of being compiled for the IAEA and for the purpose of giving it coverage, broad coverage. All this information is in the reports and it has been published. Yes, it is indeed the case that this information was not published in detail in the maps, because the procedure was such that in the event of serious accidents this information was privileged and was being offered to all the organizations dealing with eliminating this accident. That is what the procedure was like and we are no exception as far as all these organizations and departments are concerned. I can say, and repeat yet again, that the local authorities did have these maps and this information. So we bear an equal share in the responsibility for the publication or nonpublication of this material. After all, the first question is: Was there any information? Yes, there was information. It was given out, and it only changed in respect of detail. That is the most important thing.

Apart from that, the measurements that we carried out were performed in accordance with the criteria that were presented. Initially, it was necessary to save people from the external gamma radiation, and we really did measure the area—we singled out and identified the area—where a person might pick up more than 10 rem during the first year. This criterion, which was provided by the Ministry of Health, was the main one, and we carried out the first screenings, taking this criterion as our starting-point. This was the first stage of the government commission's work, and this work by the government commission was, from my point of view, carried out very vigorously and very efficiently.

The second stage was when the isotopes were measured—the composition of radionuclides. These isotopes were measured during May and June. In July, they were reported at a meeting of the Politburo's operational

group—in July—and there was a dilemma here. There was one criterion then: 10 rem during the first year. There was a dilemma: Either we had to move members of the public out, wherever; in the long term, if they lived there for a long time, people might receive a dose of internal, as well as external, radiation. I am saying that, initially, external radiation was the more dangerous. There was the question of whether to cut off internal radiation by not consuming local, locally produced food or to lose these people. This decision was being made in July, and the evacuation of those villages that was adopted, and is regarded as the second stage, occurred during August and, perhaps, September. An additional 34 villages were evacuated: 29 villages in Belorussia, four villages in the Russian Federation, and one village in the Ukraine—Bober. The republics thought that they could supply uncontaminated food to the villages that are located on the borderline where the external radiation is under 10 rem and the internal radiation may be more. We in the Ministry of Health and State Committee for Hydrometeorology, since we provided those figures when calculating the doses, also, of course, signed these proposals. They were adopted in July, I repeat.

To continue, the next stage is the one that we are experiencing now, because, after the first three years, for which the Ministry of Health had issued the criteria 10 rem [roentgen-equivalent-man], 3.5, and 2.5 rem, the Ministry of Health worked out the concept of 35 rem in 1988. This has been mentioned many times today, and the concept has been severely criticized and subjected to widespread discussion. Since it was necessary to decide what should be done next, the government, it seems to me, properly proceeded in the following manner: without waiting for the end of the scientific discussion, it evacuated the villages that have radioactivity and caesium contamination of over 40 curies/sq km—in other words, without waiting for people to absorb a higher dose. It introduced for those families either a decision stating "which have children and pregnant women," or programs which set out the question of voluntary evacuation. [sentence as heard]

Clearly, we must very seriously consider that question, talking not only about specific criteria, but, in general, of the whole range of contamination. The question arises here of measurements. Broader measurements are required here. The measurements we made and those made up to 1 curie/sq km require more detail. We have conducted over 100,000 trials. But today, if approval is given to a program and approach involving voluntary evacuation, then every person needs to find out how much contamination there is in his own yard, his own home, and in the street where he lives. In other words, an enormous quantity of measurements is required.

Belorussia, for example, will even set aside the question of measuring the state of radioactivity, and the radiation situation in general, in those villages in Belorussia. It really is a vast amount of work, which must, clearly, be done very broadly. That's the trouble: it's not ready. A

certain part of that work will be carried out. Subsequently, there will be both the funds and, apparently, the extension of that work—the creation of special, perhaps financially autonomous, organizations that might be able to finish the work quickly.

We're talking about the third and fourth stage. I, as a forecaster in this particular case—it was correctly said here that our program has no forecast, and that's a shortcoming—I think that the examination of questions about the population, about the evacuation of people, will not end with today's examination. We must keep on forecasting, and so it really is necessary to possess information. It is, of course, necessary to possess certain calculations in the field of socioeconomic directions, because evacuation is now taking place not only through radiation factors, but with account being taken of socioeconomic causes. All these matters must be borne in mind, and the vast amount of work must, clearly, be continued.

Now, very briefly, since I've been asked still more questions—the question of Korosten, the town of Korosten. How hard we found it to handle something that we previously knew nothing about! [laughter] We encountered the following difficulty, and the population came up against it, too: in some places that were relatively not heavily contaminated spots where very high levels of contamination suddenly started to appear.

Korosten is an example. The average contamination level there is 6-7 curies/sq km throughout the zone. But spots have appeared there in which, expressed in square-kilometer terms, these levels attained 200 curies/sq km. You understand? But they don't measure a square kilometer. They are small spots, a few square meters or tens of square meters in size, that have formed or have just flowed together from roofs, or that have formed as a result of passage of contaminated equipment, and these spots have to be eliminated immediately.

There were requests on the subject, and civil defense actually said that, specifically in order to eliminate these hot spots, as has been described in PRAVDA, a team has been organized in Korosten that is carrying out, and has already practically finished, the decontamination of these hot spots. As for the decontamination of the whole of Korosten, about which there have also been questions, Comrade Govorov, the head of civil defense, says that, according to their plan, this should be happening in May.

However, as far as these hot spots are concerned, I just want to explain. They do, of course, demand very serious attention, but in Korosten specifically, their area amounts to 16,000 sq m, while the town's area is 35 sq km. In other words, one-tenth of one percent of the area. But, of course, these spots are impermissible. They must immediately be decontaminated as soon as they appear. They will appear in various towns and villages. This must be borne in mind.

Now for the last thing spoken of here. I don't think now is the time to draw the discussion out, but I am returning

to it once again, since deputy Shcherbak has raised this question—it is the question of the evacuation of the city of Kiev. We, as experts, provided our findings as experts about the absence of indications for evacuation of the city of Kiev on 7 May 1986, the matter concerned evacuation of the whole city insofar as it was from the point of view of evacuation of the children, but at the session of the bureau of the Ukrainian Central Committee the question of speedy evacuation of children was examined, and this was settled in the affirmative, that is, the next day a resolution of the Ukrainian Council of ministers came out which prescribed cutting the school year short to 15 May and evacuating schoolchildren up to the seventh grade as far as possible, to places which were not contaminated as a result of the accident. We were present all the time, and now, of course, one can interpret things in various ways, but I would like to say that we participated in this part of the discussion, and we were in agreement with this. As far as an evacuation is concerned, indeed, that is the conclusion we came to as experts. Naturally, one could have turned to other experts, if our findings were thought to be incorrect.

The final thing concerned with the program—there is a major observation. Where they speak of information centers, I would consider that these information centers, which will compile bulletins and so on, need to be combined with press centers. It is extremely important to establish centralized information in the broad press which is accessible to everybody, because the broad press—I won't quote any figures, because there are a great deal of very crude distortions, unfounded accusations, it is very difficult to react to all of them, we have to explain things literally almost every day because of this, and I think that if the information centers are combined with press centers, this will be extremely useful, and extremely useful work will be done.

The last thing I would like to say about the programs is that they have said here that it has taken four years to arrive at the programs; but the first years, the first two years, were also a program being implemented by the whole country, and this should not have been discounted by any means. I don't know, I don't want to argue with anyone or make accusations, but after all, many of those who are presently being given the floor—in particular I am here, and my colleagues, and the medical men, and those from the State Agro-Industrial Committee, and so on and so forth—we were there the whole time, months at a time, in the zone of the Chernobyl accident, and first and foremost precisely in those zones which were being evacuated first of all. That is so. And then the area began to embrace more and more in quantity, after these issues were really studied, medicine added new findings, and experts were involved—and you know the conclusions of the experts.

I have received one question: you should not refer to the IAEA—I am not referring to the IAEA; are you familiar with the 1987 report by Mr [as heard] Gro Harlem Brundtland, chairman of the UN International Commission for Environment, which raises the question of

depriving the IAEA of rights as an extradepartmental expert body, since there are signs of international lobbying in the IAEA, and the IAEA is a commercial organ with an interest in the development (of atomic power stations)? I think that it is not worth answering this question, because I think we can decide for ourselves which international organizations we call in, or it is worth calling in. So, taking this into account, of course, we have to think about this serious question. We know, of course, that the IAEA is a respectable organization, but if we go completely into details, then at the moment, for example, people, organizations have emerged which have started making their own measurements, independently of the existing procedures. They go off and gather earth in sacks, they bring them to these cooperatives or these people—who are these people doing the measurements? We don't know. Of course, what is needed here, I consider, is definitely the coordination which we have had up until now.

Political & Social

Further Reportage on May Day Celebration

Leaders 'Forced' To Leave Square

LD0205195290 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] On 1 May trade unions held a massive rally in Red Square in Moscow. Mikhail Gorbachev and other national leaders were on the stand of the Lenin mausoleum. The participants passed a resolution stressing the unions' determined will to protect the workers' interests. They then gave way to a demonstration of the Moscow Voters' Union which brought together members of many political parties, movements and associations. There was no official censure of the slogans but the organizers promised they would be constitutional. However, some of the slogans were openly provocative and aimed at confrontation with constitutional authorities. That forced the leaders on the stand including the newly elected Moscow mayor, Gavriil Popov, to leave the square.

Rallies and marches were also held around the country and heard a variety of political views expressed; 2 May was marked by traditional open air festivals, concerts and athletic competitions.

Traditional, Alternate Events Held

PM0205153790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report under the general headline "All-Union May Day 1990" by IZVESTIYA correspondents L. Kapelyushnyy, E. Kondratov, I. Litvinova, and L. Levitskiy]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Vilnius

[Kapelyushnyy report] The traditional red calico of May Day is not to be seen on the streets this time. And it is

only when you get nearer to Lenin Square that people carrying flags, placards, and banners appear. The words on the homemade placards were topical, so to speak, reflecting the mood of that section of Lithuanian society which had turned out for the May Day procession. I want to stress this point—they were there not for a rally or demonstration but for a May Day celebration organized by the Federation of Lithuanian Working People and the Lithuanian Communist Party-CPSU. The independent Communist Party Central Committee issued a statement before the holiday that there would be meetings in labor collectives in preference to demonstrations and rallies. Although on the eve of the festival V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, addressed the republic's inhabitants via a telegram broadcast on television in which he recognized the traditions of May Day and the importance of the international solidarity of people of good will, the government itself did not take part in the May Day events.

At the start of May Day there were about 200-300 citizens carrying placards and flags. But imperceptibly the square became crowded, and when people entered Gediminas Avenue and moved toward Nagornyy Park, where a second, unofficial part of the May Day event was due to be held, the avenue was entirely taken over by the May Day festival.

It cannot be said that the procession of the May Day columns across the city went unobserved. There were citizens at the open windows of apartment blocks and hotels, the windows of stores, and on the sidewalk. Today they were simply spectators who felt no inner urge to express solidarity with the "reds."

Political speeches alternated with performances by local amateur artists at the May Day event in Nagornyy Park, and the modest holiday trade service that had been organized had trouble coping with demand.

Secretaries and members of the Lithuanian Communist Party-CPSU Central Committee Bureau took part in the May Day event. Mikolas Burokavicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party-CPSU Central Committee, delivered the opening address.

Kishinev

[Kondratov report] This year's May Day was the first official holiday where the combination of Moldavia's historic colors—blue, yellow, and red—gained state status. For the first time the tricolor, approved on the eve of the festival by the session of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet as the republic's flag, was not in opposition to the red banner but coexisted alongside it in its own right.

Such was the May Day rally dedicated to the International Day of Working People's Solidarity. It brought together on the main square of the republic's capital many thousands of people from the city plus guests from Romania. They heard an address from the platform by USSR People's Deputy G. Yeremey, chairman of the

Moldavian Trade Union Council, and representatives of the city's working people, social organizations, and movements. The demonstrators' placards and banners sported slogans calling for the fraternity and unification of the world's working people, the development of democracy, and the consolidation of progressive forces, along with appeals for true independence for Moldavia. Moldavians are supported in this desire by Russians, Ukrainians, Gagauzes, Bulgarians, and Jews, who believe that in a truly sovereign republic national minorities should be ensured full equality of civil rights.

Throughout the day the people celebrated in the streets and squares, music was played, and professional and amateur art collectives gave performances.

Riga

[Litvinova report] All who appealed to the Latvian population—Let us turn out for May Day!—were calling for solidarity. Unfortunately, as has already happened in the republic, even such a familiar slogan was interpreted by each political force in its own way. The Latvian People's Front in its pre-May Day address urged people "to surmount the understanding of internationalism and solidarity that has become distorted over the decades," and to meet on Daugava Embankment at midday and "confirm their loyalty to Baltic unity." The independent Latvian Communist Party Central Committee as usual aped the People's Front. It invited Rigans and the Latvian Communist Party city committee to attend a holiday demonstration at the same place just two hours earlier. The sad fact is that it was far easier to declare an abstract solidarity than to show solidarity with the working people of their city or enterprise. Such was the "solidarity:" Residents from the same block and workers from the same team appearing at different times, in different columns, and carrying different slogans.

At the last moment—the day before the demonstration—the People's Front's May Day plans changed drastically. Radio and television urgently broadcast its announcement: The Latvian People's Front demonstration is canceled, the city is full of "sinister forces" dressed as Soviet assault troops, do nothing provocative. Assault troopers were indeed walking around Riga, in a break between preparations for the parade (to be held 9 May), treating themselves to ice cream....

But the festival did take place. Those people who valued it more than prejudice did not believe the "well-informed" rumormongers. Columns followed the old routes around the city—although admittedly some of the streets bear different names now. Ten days before May Day Riga renamed the street bearing the name of Petr Stuchka, the first leader of the Soviet Government in Latvia, and the street named for Hero of the Soviet Union Imant Sudmalis....

Speakers at the rally talked about the intolerability of discrimination against any groups of the population and equality of rights for the peoples living in Latvia, and they urged the Supreme Soviet not to rush its "historic"

decisions, but to consider how they will affect the fate of people living in the republic. The fact that federative ideas are strong in the republic was shown by the repeat elections to the Supreme Soviet held 29 April. Those candidates who opposed Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR scored a convincing victory. [passage omitted]

Tallinn

[Levitskiy report] The early spring has worked hard to replace the austere grey of old Tallinn with a soft, mild green. There were disputes as to how to commemorate Solidarity Day. The city soviet and Estonian Communist Party City Committee chose a neutral form in this politically charged atmosphere. Those who share the ideas of May Day were invited to Vabaduse Square—Liberty Square. That is where parades and demonstrations are traditionally held. Today it hosted a May Day rally. Organized columns came from enterprises in Kalininskiy and Morskoy Rayons.

"We did not want to change the good working tradition and held a meeting, as always," fishermen from the "Estrybprom" Association said. "And we decided to tell the politicians what we want. We want equal rights for Estonia and its development and prosperity within the Union of Soviet Republics. It is necessary to work more and better—it takes more than fine words to make life better...."

Slogans like the fishermen's predominated in other columns of demonstrators, too. There were also alternative appeals for independent statehood and "good-neighborly relations between Estonia and the USSR." They were fewer in number—but only because the majority of Estonians who share these beliefs did not go to the square. Nor did collectives from enterprises in Leninskiy and Oktyabrskiy Rayons take part in the rally.

The majority of rally participants, with a band at their head, then set off along the boulevard to the V.I. Lenin Monument, where they laid flowers.

May Day rallies were held in other cities in the republic, too. They began in the morning in Narva in front of three culture centers—those of the power industry workers, the "Baltiyets" plant, and the "Krengolmskaya manufaktura" plant. Then the three columns of working people went to Petrovskaya Square. Popular celebrations continued after the rally in Narva.

Cities' May Day Events Reported

PM0205123990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[Reportage by "our correspondents" V. Artemenko, M. Volkov, N. Volynskiy, G. Dildayev, T. Yesilbayev, Z. Kadyzbekov, N. Lashkevich, G. Lebanidze, O. Levitskiy, L. Makhkamov, O. Meshkov, M. Odinets, A. Pasechnik, Yu. Ragulyayev, A. Sarkisyan, A. Simurov, I. Tikhomirov, and A. Ulitenok: "May Day Banners Over Our Country"]

[Excerpts] Perhaps for the first time in recent decades the rostrum on Leningrad's Palace Square was empty. There were no honored guests, workers of the diplomatic corps, or city leaders. That was how, without the usual demonstration, without music and flowers, the Leningrad City Soviet decided to celebrate May Day on the main square of the city of three revolutions. Initially the deputies planned to hold a citywide meeting here at their own initiative. But at the last moment they abandoned a measure which could have caused too great a concentration of people.

By 1000 hours a column of demonstrators organized by the union of voters and the Leningrad People's Front had approached Palace Square. The flags of various parties and societies fluttered over the crowd. Those taking part carried posters and political slogans of sometimes directly opposite content.... The meeting was led by Leningrad City Soviet deputies. Although it had been announced in advance in the local press that the measure was to be devoted to the themes of friendship, internationalism, and political pluralism, one and the same note nonetheless predominated on the square—the now banal reproaches and accusations against the CPSU and the government. It was a long way from pluralism here. So that after about an hour people began gradually to disperse.

The picture was somewhat different in Kirovskiy Rayon, for instance, near the "Severnaya Verf" plant. At the entrance, where the first May Day celebration in Russia was held 99 years ago, working people and inhabitants of the Narvskaya Gate gathered. B. Bogomolov, first secretary of the Kirovskiy CPSU Rayon Committee, addressed greetings to them. Flowers were laid at the granite obelisk in memory of the first May Day celebration. Military seamen gave a small amateur concert for those assembled. Then the demonstration took place.

Processions, demonstrations, people's walkabouts, and concerts also took place in Vasileostrovskiy, Moskovskiy, and other rayons of the city.

Kiev.... The October Revolution Square was in festive array. Columns of many thousands of representatives of the working people of all 14 of the Ukrainian capital's rayons converged here according to tradition. Red calico banners and fine posters fluttered above them. Bands played.

But there were many differences this time. The leaders of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the republic's government and of city organizations marched in the demonstrators' columns. With the party veterans, leading workers of the labor collectives, and figures of culture, they then climbed a small hill.

...A few days ago, during an "ecological demonstration," young thugs on the rampage had tried to place a barbed wire "wreath" with blasphemous inscriptions on the monument to V.I. Lenin. The extremists' escapade caused a wave of protest in the labor collectives. The newspapers published an appeal to the communists to

unite and to lead people behind them. The May Day demonstration was the first step toward this. The participants in the procession held posters angrily denouncing the stoking of antistate passions and nationalist sentiments.

For the first time representatives of "Green World," "RUKH," and other organizations took part in the festive demonstration. Their flags were drowned in the scarlet calico sea of banners.

At the end of the May Day procession V. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and other leaders of the republic, leaving the hill, were closely surrounded by those taking part in the celebration. There was a relaxed talk and answers were given to urgent questions.

The celebration of May Day in Kiev showed graphically how great is the potential of the constructive forces and their readiness to achieve the goals set by perestroika. [passage omitted]

The two previous May Day holidays in Lithuania took place without celebratory processions and demonstrations. The government rostrum past which the festive columns of demonstrators used to march in the recent past was not erected opposite the monument to Lenin in Vilnius. The republic's present parliament and government have other concerns. Actually, May Day remained a red letter day in the calendar and is considered a nonworking day.

Nonetheless a May Day celebration did take place in the republic's capital. The Socialist Federation of Working people of Lithuania together with the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) took the initiative for holding the celebration. After laying flowers at the monument to Lenin on the square of the same name and after a meeting, the columns of demonstrators with red banners, placards, and posters, set off for Nagornyy park, where the festive May Day celebration took place. It was devoted to a demonstration of the cohesion of the Lithuanian working people concerned for the destiny of perestroika in the republic. The content of the posters was eloquent: "No to confrontation with the USSR!", "Lithuanian parliament, heed the voice of reason!", "No to confrontation between the peoples of Lithuania", and others. Concerts were held in the park and stall trading was organized. [passage omitted]

The Riga City Executive Committee allocated just an hour for the festive demonstration by representatives of the Latvian capital's working people and public. At 1000 hours the participants assembled on the Komsomolskaya embankment, renamed the 11 November embankment not long before the holiday. Above the rostrum was a bas relief of V.I. Lenin and the slogan "Long live freedom, fraternity, equality, and the happiness of all peoples!"

A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, congratulated those assembled on the holiday. In his speech he spoke of the need to strengthen the unity of all progressive forces in the struggle for the success of perestroika and against separatism and nationalism. Those taking part in the demonstration welcomed with stormy applause the speech by USSR People's Deputy V. Alksnis, chairman of the Latvian deputies' "Union" group. Then representatives of the working class and intelligentsia spoke. A resolution was adopted unanimously urging an active struggle for a free, sovereign Latvia within a renewed USSR federation. The demonstration ended with the singing of the "International." [passage omitted]

The present May Day in the Tajik capital was marked in an untraditional way. In the eruption of nature's spring colors and the meager spots of red calico, the concealed tension of a city which has been living under emergency situation conditions for over two months now was nonetheless successfully resolved in a minimum of compulsory events. There was a brief citywide meeting and all holiday events were as close as possible to Dushanbe people's places of residence. It turned out that the holiday loses nothing without the many hours of processions and the tiring wait by tens of thousands of people for their turn to pass in front of the rostrum. Every park, square, and small microrayon area was quite organically transformed by the concern of the local authorities into a little island of friendly communication.

With the inhabitants of Dushanbe the holiday was celebrated by K. Makhkamov, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee, I. Khayeyev, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, and other leaders.

May Day demonstrations of working people and meetings were held in the republic's cities and rayon centers.

...Even on the holiday Armenia was unsettled. Alarming news came in from Stepanakert on the days preceding May Day. Freedom Square was again seething with many thousands of people taking part in a meeting, there was an extraordinary session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, which examined the question of the political situation in Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. But despite everything the people's walkabouts and sports competitions took place in Yerevan 1 May. [passage omitted]

In Ashkhabad the holiday convoys of demonstrators were headed by workers of Proletarskiy Rayon. They achieved the best results in production, in housing construction, and the services sphere.

Our correspondent talked with B. Sardzhiyev, who was elected first secretary of the Ashkhabad Party City Committee literally a few days ago.

The city communists completely renewed the leading echelon at their recent conference. With what is this connected?

"The communists," Vatyur Kurbanovich said, "want the renewal to bring tangible changes. It is obviously no accident that this year Yazgul Durdyeva, an alumna of the post graduate study course of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, for instance, was elected our secretary for ideology. She knows seven languages, which is of some importance in our multinational city. She is distinguished by her breadth of vision and the quest for nonstandard solutions. I do not want to discredit the city committee's previous leadership. Good, honest people, they were in charge of the situation and knew the painful spots. But today that is not enough. In my opinion more vigorous workers are needed, not affected with the psychological corrosion, so to speak, of the times of stagnation."

...People treated May Day in various ways in Estonia. Some welcomed it as the day of the working people's solidarity. Others, and there are also quite a lot of them, reckoned there was no cause to stir up an "undesirable legacy."

Of course, you cannot organize a holiday for anyone by force. But should we consign to the past what has already become the possession of mankind—a sense of unity among working people? The city soviet decided to hold a May Day meeting on Freedom Square. Yesterday all those for whom solidarity is a conviction and a necessity came to the meeting.

Those taking part in the meeting were addressed by E. Tamm, deputy chairman of the city soviet, S. Kallas, chairman of the republic's central council of trade unions, and A. Gusev, secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform). The speakers defended various positions, but they all stressed the need for common labor and civic peace for the sake of the republic's future.

After the end of the meeting those taking part advanced in a dense column several blocks long along V.I. Lenin boulevard to the monument to the founder of our state and laid flowers which actually drowned the foot of the monument. This warm, human end to the celebrations really embellished May Day.

...The watchword of the present spring holiday over the expanses of our country has been the consolidation of all healthy forces on a principled basis. The people's walkabouts in the cities and villages continued until late evening.

More on Organizing Rally

LD2504092190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1721 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (TASS)—The Moscow City Council of Trade Unions (MCCTU) has declared its intention of staging a procession in the center of Moscow

and a rally in Red Square on 1 May, the day of international solidarity of the working people. Speaking at a press conference held here today, MCCTU Deputy Chairman Valeriy Stroganov announced that the Moscow trade unions had received permission to arrange these events from the Soviet capital's municipal authorities.

All 25 Sectoral trade unions operating in Moscow have confirmed their readiness to take part in the procession and the rally. Rally organizers estimate that some 50,000 people will assemble in Red Square on 1 May.

Invitations to take part in the May Day rally in Red Square, the MCCTU representative announced, have been sent to the USSR president, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the country's Council of Ministers. Trade union activists, labor veterans and foreign trade union delegations have also been invited.

A number of public organizations, including the Moscow Voters' Association [moskovskoye obyedineniye izbirateley], are expected to hold their own rally in Red Square on the same day. "Muscovites are entitled to choose for themselves what rally they will attend," Valeriy Stroganov said.

Academies Hold Meeting To Mark Lenin Anniversary

PM2404101390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 21 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Source of Strength and Inspiration"]

[Text] 19 Apr—A joint scientific session of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy on the topic "Social Practice and the Socialist Ideal in the 20th Century" was held in Moscow today to mark the 120th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth.

A report was delivered by Colonel General N.F. Kizyun, chief of the Military-Political Academy, and Prof. I.I. Antonovich, prorector of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

Maslennikov Briefs on Gorbachev Trip, Baltics

PM3004140090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Anatoliy Stepovoy report from the Kremlin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Briefing by the USSR President's Press Service"]

[Text] A briefing for representatives of the Soviet and foreign press was held 28 April by A. Maslennikov, press secretary to the USSR president.

He told journalists about the results of M.S. Gorbachev's trip to the Urals, which showed that there is a very large stratum of public political support for perestroika among the population of the Urals.

So attempts to depict the working class as some kind of conservative force which would rather like to go back to the old ways are unfounded.

The president said that he intends to raise at the Presidential Council a number of questions that the trip highlighted.

The press secretary did not ignore the situation in Lithuania. The approach of the president and the government to the Lithuanian situation, A. Maslennikov stated, is not changing. The line is one of settling the problem within the framework of the Constitution, on the basis of existing legislation, and with the help of peaceful dialogue. The joint letter from French President Mitterrand and FRG Chancellor Kohl to Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Landsbergis calling on him to embark on a path of seeking political solutions is not far removed from the line pursued by the USSR leadership from the outset. And U.S. President Bush's position indicates the seriousness with which he approaches this problem.

A question from IZVESTIYA's correspondent: "Does the president know about the crisis situation that exists in our parliament because of the absence of certain republican deputations? And what is his attitude to the statement by the deputies from Estonia on their suspension of their participation in Supreme Soviet sessions until the start of official talks between Estonia and the Soviet Union?"

[Maslennikov] This question was not raised and has not been discussed by the president. But I can say that ultimatums of any kind, especially to the president, from wherever they may originate, are unacceptable tactics. All those who have now been elected to representative organs at various levels should set about fulfilling the mandates they received from their voters, rather than trying to play the part of supreme government in every specific instance. Whether at republican level or at the level of an oblast, a city, or a village soviet. A tendency can be observed for people virtually to repeal the USSR Constitution. That is not the way. This is a kind of "infantile disease" of our parliamentarianism.

Gorbachev May Have 'Lost His Way'

PM0205113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy L.I. Sukhov by own correspondent Yu. Makhurin in Moscow under the rubric "The Party and Perestroika. Leading Up to the 28th CPSU Congress": "Resignation Not Accepted"—date unspecified; first two paragraphs are an introduction]

[Excerpts] Thanks to television, people know the faces of most people's deputies and do not have to rely solely on official stenographic reports from the Kremlin. Leonid Ivanovich Sukhov, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and driver from Kharkov, has stuck in many

people's minds. It was he who ascended the rostrum of the recent congress to announce that he was relinquishing his powers as deputy. Judging from the PRAVDA mailbag, readers were upset by the deputy's action: "He really is a man of the people, an ordinary worker, and it is a pity that there are so few of them in our parliament." "He has abandoned the battlefield!" "He has shown weakness!" "He has thrown down a challenge to the phrasemongers, under whose numbing prattle the country is falling apart at the seams!" A hail of questions have rained down on the editorial office.

Well, the agitated, somewhat muddled speech by the deputy when he announced his resignation did not really make it possible to judge the reasons behind such a desperate step. That is why the editorial office assigned its correspondent to a meeting with L.I. Sukhov. All the papers for the journalist's trip to Kharkov were ready, when the deputy unexpectedly returned to Moscow for the Supreme Soviet session that had already begun.

"The voters did not accept my resignation," Leonid Ivanovich explained. "They said: We support your stand as deputy, go back to the Kremlin and fight!"

"I made my stand clear during the election battles: the protection of the poor and the weak. The strong do not need a defender. People had faith in my program and voted for me. Incidentally, I put myself forward as candidate for deputy. My rivals were strong and highly educated. That could not be said of me: Just evening classes and a hard life for 50 years. I grew up in a large family, and have five children myself."

[Makhlin] Could you give us more details about your meetings with people in your area.

[Sukhov] I had 22 meetings in all. In people's homes and in labor collectives, including my own motor transport enterprise. They criticized me for showing weakness.

I was asked a lot of questions at these meetings. I was asked, for example, how I voted when the question of presidential power was being discussed. I replied that, in my view, the president must be elected by all the people and so I voted "against" at the congress.

Generally speaking, I felt in Moscow that I was just getting under other people's feet. But my voters rejected this argument. [passage omitted]

[Makhlin] You said at the congress that one reason for your resignation was "the fact that we are still trampling on the bones of our history. He who tramples on his past has no future."

[Sukhov] Yes, I find it offensive that our country's history is being besmirched from various rostrums, including the Kremlin. Criticism is one thing, but blackening the name of your country is the same as reviling your own mother. It is blasphemy!

You see, however much they have tried, no one on the other side of the border has been able to overcome a

great power as ours from the outside. But now some people are trying to destroy it from the inside. I sit in the auditorium and feel indignant listening to some communists' speeches, although I am not actually a party member myself. It is absurd: A Communist rejecting everything that represents the idea and the soul of the CPSU, speaking out in favor of restoring private ownership and the exploitation of man by his fellow man.... It transpires that all his life he has not been true to himself, has lied to himself and to others, and is now flaunting his perfidy. It is awful to be near such people. We are being deceived, even the press is deceiving us, skillfully steering us in the direction of capitalism, as if it would bring ordinary people nothing but good.

Incidentally, when some USSR people's deputies voiced their opinions on removing Lenin's body from the mausoleum, I was ready to do battle with them at the time. But now I think to myself: What if Ilich could suddenly get up and walk? He would take to his heels and run from the Kremlin himself, run from communists like these. Not only from the boring obsessives and double-dealers. I, a non-party person, can see that the general secretary and members of the Politburo are poorly defending the ideas of Marx and Lenin, have lost the initiative, and are surrendering one position after another. They should go and uphold these ideas, then people would see that the party is capable of peeling off the rust and becoming militant and battle-worthy again. [passage omitted]

[Makhlin] So the alarm you felt deep down has been coming to a head the whole year you have spent working in parliament?

[Sukhov] I have felt mounting alarm with every passing day. For example, my colleagues imperturbably discuss the unemployment that will result in our country from the switch to a market economy. As if it were nothing of moment at all! But I understand that the working people will suffer under a market economy.

The USSR trade minister boasted to us that elements of a free market are already yielding a profit: "150 Volgas have been sold at an average price of R50,000." So I got up and said that this is criminal. Who bought them for such fantastic sums of money? Academicians? It seems not. Then those who did must be criminals, because tomorrow they will have R100,000.

There is something else that worries me. Mikhail Sergeyevich is a strong politician, of course. But either he is not managing to get to grips with everything or he has lost his way and does not have the courage to admit this even to himself.

Evidently, in their hearts my voters are also feeling concerned. We talk and talk, while the situation in our country could not get any worse. It seems to me that we have harnessed a bull and a horse together, but still want to make rapid progress. People are tired of all the talking. The situation suits some people, however: While we talk, they are engaging in their shady affairs. They have gotten rich during perestroika and are buying up gold, carpets,

and crystal. It is true that everyone has his own cross to bear: Some people's pearls are too small, while others' soup is too thin. [passage omitted]

Democratic Platform Stance Defended

PM2704145490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No. 16, 22 Apr 90 p 5

[Len Karpinskiy article: "Welcome. No Trespassers!"]

[Text] The name of the film—"Welcome. No Trespassers!"—a movie about a Young Pioneer camp during the stagnation period—could easily become the subtitle to the CPSU Central Committee's Open Letter to the country's Communists, published last week.

The "trespassers", according to this fresh party document, are those of our country's Communists who risked proposing a Democratic Platform, full of initiative, for the 28th Congress.

According to the Open Letter, what are these Communists guilty of? They "attacked the ideological and organizational bases of the CPSU"; they planned "to turn our party into some shapeless association with complete freedom for factions and groupings"; "they are attempting to split the CPSU from inside and remove from the political arena". And, we are told, they have committed other sins.

But, essentially speaking, there is no reason to find that out here. Because the very letter of the Central Committee is not in essence but, if I can say so, "about something". The document does not develop, finalize, direct or sharpen the discussion on the party's real problems—it covers it up, substituting pressure on people because of their criticism of ideas. An attempt was made to solve by an order (an ideological label is also a sort of order) that which precisely the congress itself must decide in a meaningful polemic. Therefore, a group of party members, even in the CPSU Central Committee, obtain for themselves, in fact, the prerogatives of the entire party as represented by the congress delegates. It is hard to imagine what could more strongly push the party towards a split (even though they used the euphemism "demarcation"), than this step from the top.

Fulfilling the closed directive, which, as it is said, preceded the Open Letter, some of the "democrats" have already been ousted, others are invited to have a talk about this, and the party press never tires of advising: "You disagree with the party? Then go away. You see, that would be more honest". No, it won't be more honest. And posing the question is sly as usual. What party do you "disagree with"? As if there is some monolith, which is right and shines in unity, on the one hand, and separate ambitions splitters on the other. But the mystification doesn't work any more. Now, when hearing about a party, only a rare person would not ask you—what, concretely, are you speaking about? The ruling, "official" group in the party, which is immersed in the power apparatus and which expresses—under the

flag of concern for the working people—the interests of the state—the work provider, or the rank-and-file members of the formerly same party (there were no other parties), who are marked in the same way by a prolonged non-participation in substantial political activity? Precisely this fundamental split, fixed by decades, turned out not to be the objective source of many cracks in the party monolith; the cracks have covered literally the entire structural and world-considering spectrum of party life. But what does the Democratic Platform have to do with this?

There is talk about "purification" of the party. All right, only let us decide openly, before people—who'll be "purging" whom and for what. The letter demands to figure out "who have, with their views and behaviour in fact put themselves outside the party". That's wonderful, but again, let us do this openly, without double locks on the doors. And check, at the same time, if some leaders of the Democratic Platform, as is claimed by the CPSU letter, are "pursuing selfish ends"? Having proclaimed the power of party masses, let us give the masses the opportunity to figure it out. And the election of delegates, according to platforms, is a good opportunity for this.

But, as it looks, it was precisely such a turn of events that alarmed the authors of the Open Letter. Otherwise it is hard to explain a lot of things. Now the central party paper prints the Democratic Platform text, organizes a round table with participation of its initiators, holds a discussion respectfully, and in its course, alongside with criticism of some point of the document, ever more often stresses how it coincides with the draft of the Central Committee's main Platform, and draws lines for a possible agreeing of positions. Then, suddenly, a U-turn—the talk goes in an entirely different direction. There are no opponents, there are no competitors even, but there are enemies, some sort of hostile force. Discussion in the Open Letter becomes a language for repression.

In the name of what? The following sentence from the letter—"It is important that convinced Communists will become Congress delegates"—provides certain light. But it is possible to understand different things under the words "convinced Communists". Here's a fragment of a letter recently published in Pravda. "I've been a party member for 30 years now. All these years I sacredly believed in the excellence of its programmes and tried to implement them as I could. I never doubted the correctness of the decisions adopted. Defamation of Stalin's personality cult—I'm 'for' it! Give us corn, bread with corn and peas—I'm 'for' it! Economic departments—I'm 'for' that! 1985—the start of perestroika in the country. And I'm again 'for' it—from the bottom of my heart. Then who am I? Are there many of us, such people?" Alas, there are as yet very many such people and, therefore, they'll be legally represented at the congress, too. But aren't the Open Letter's authors dreaming only of them or how to mainly represent them?

The situation is getting clearer little-by-little. The profound meaning of the Central Committee message is, probably, an attempt to take some kind of revenge for having to give up the notorious Article 6 of our Constitution. As they say—the Article dies, but its cause is alive! The foundation of the political supremacy has disappeared, but the spirit of the elite is unbreakable.

The opportunity of each and every Communist to take part in the pre-Congress discussion is being solemnly proclaimed, but with a characteristic "but"—within the limits and on the basis of the draft Platform and CPSU Rules, offered by the Central Committee. And outside these limits, on a different, alternative basis, found outside of the Central Committee? It is explained to us that these drafts "are open for any proposals and amendments". Why, then, are they closed, for example, for proposals about factions and opinions on horizontal structures? Doesn't that mean that they are open not for "any" but only for the previously approved? Here is the essence—the monopoly on the truth is turned in the Open Letter into a monopoly on the very designing of the truth, and the Centre's traditional domination over thoughts—becomes domination over plans. By the way, about factions. It's ridiculous to recognize the possibility of different platforms in a party but then forbid the possibility of factions. A platform is not a paper body that lives somewhere in empty space. It is a lively activity of people who are, of course, connected in some way with each other. Therefore a faction is the same platform from the side of real activities and structures.

Earlier it was quite correctly noted that some judgements of advocates of the Democratic Platform were much too radical and excessively categorical. But after the radicalness, pronounced on the behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the drawbacks in the style and tone of the "democrats" seem to be really nothing. As it turns out, the differences in the understanding of perestroika's problems and tasks "can and must be a subject of all-round discussion", only if "they don't refute the party's ideological-theoretic and organizational foundations." Therefore, what's useful for the party is useful for perestroika, but not the other way around. Does the party itself think of restructuring if it stands on such lopsided logic? Because then everything freezes up in the old egotistical outline—"who's not with us is against us!" Or to be more precise—the one who's independent of us is against us.

The letter has demonstrated with extreme clarity for the first time, that the party on the whole lags behind the processes of transformation in society, only because a rather big portion of it opposes these transformations. I think that the situation in which the just elected President remains the General Secretary is the saddest. If the General Secretary agrees with the Open Letter's authors about such an interpretation of political pluralism inside the party, then what does the President think about pluralism in society?

But it would be impermissible not to notice, besides the nearest utility aims pursued by the letter's authors in preparation for the Congress, also other "far-reaching plans" as it's now fashionable to say. In the letter one can clearly see the famous Point 7 of the resolution of the 10th Congress of the RCP(b) [Russian Communist Party—Bolshevik] which ruled that people can be expelled from the party for taking part in groupings and factionalism. It is quite in place to reproduce in the political memory an episode, in its time quite well known, that happened at a conference of old party-members, former underground workers (it was held in intercessions between the Congress sessions). Lenin called the mentioned point a machine-gun which must be "put loaded and even trained on" so that it would be possible to "shoot at those wishing to split" in case there were the slightest signs of opposition. Many delegates already then had bad feelings due to this, Lenin hurried at a general meeting of the Congress to say that he was sorry for his unhappy image. He told all those present that it was only a joke and that "no one was preparing to shoot at anyone out of any machine-gun."

The subsequent history, as we know, failed to catch all the finesse of the Bolshevik humour of those flammable years. The long machine-gun bursts sounded for a long time and, what's worse of all, the bullets flew far beyond the limits of the party itself. Well, let us again start to test our fate (though as yet on the basis of the same paper that threatens only "single shots")? "Curiosity is a good thing, but many antelopes died, stopping to have a look at the hunter's hat," said Ashby, founder of cybernetics, once thinking about life under the moon. This is especially true about politics.

Let's pose the question asked by all—what kind of party do we need? If, as before, some old "denture" belonging to the authoritative bureaucratic system, that lapsed into old man's senility, then it shouldn't be changed. But if this party wants to be successful in a law-abiding society, then it has to change its image, and all the architects of the party organism need to adapt to a new role. The organism must have the freedom of choice of platform and independent associations, pluralism of opinions and constructive actions; on the other hand, it must be free of ideas based on values of centralism or the belief that decisions made by instances are holy and that any disagreement with them is splitting and disorganization. Why don't those who don't like the new emerging party leave the CPSU? It would be amoral not to make every possible effort to free the party from dictatorial methods and the desire to clutch to what is bad—something it still suffers from. It is not in society's interests to grow apathetic after the first changes in the CPSU.

Here the words by a literary character, who barked at his arrogant opponent—"you'll go away, but we never will!"—would be quite in place.

Details of Draft Defense Law Discussed

PM3004155190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Apr 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with Doctor of Juridical Sciences V.G. Strekozov, senior official of the CPSU Central Committee State and Law Department, and Candidate of Juridical Sciences, Colonel of Justice V.P. Volkov, chief of the Military Legislation Department of the USSR Defense Ministry Administration of Affairs, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA parliamentary correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev under the heading "... And About Who 'Presses the Button:' Work on Draft USSR Law on Defense Nearing Completion"—date and place unspecified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The question of the need to adopt a law regulating all aspects of military and defense building has been under discussion for quite some time now in the mass media and in the country's parliament. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA recently reported that the USSR Defense Ministry collegium had discussed the draft USSR Law on Defense at one of its sessions. The questions of what kind of law it is, what the mechanics of work on it are, and what its adoption will give to the state and the individual were the subject of a conversation between our parliamentary correspondent and Doctor of Juridical Sciences V.G. Strekozov, senior official of the CPSU Central Committee State and Law Department, and Candidate of Juridical Sciences, Colonel of Justice V.P. Volkov, chief of the Military Legislation Department of the USSR Defense Ministry Administration of Affairs.

Correspondent: This year has yielded a bumper harvest of laws. The third USSR Supreme Soviet session alone has adopted a whole package of legislative acts. Now another is being drafted: the USSR Law on Defense. The question arises: How much do we need this law? After all, we have lived for seven decades without such a law.

V. Strekozov: It is certainly true that we have never had this kind of law before. For many years, in fact from the moment when our state first came into being, we believed that the most important component of defense was the Army. If the Army was strong, that meant that our country was protected and nothing could threaten us. But you must agree that there is more to defense than an Army and a Navy. Defense is also economics, the scientific-technical and sociopolitical potential of the state, and a mass of other highly important components. But our laws have only regulated matters connected with military building in its pure form. This has meant that many important problems connected with the defense of the state have had to be resolved on the basis of a one-off procedure, departmental acts, and all manner of instructions. For example, the financing of defense installations construction is still not regulated by legislation. Sometimes this construction has been financed from the military budget, sometimes from local soviet funds, and so forth. It is often the case that questions which are solely within the competence of the USSR Council of

Ministers or even the USSR Supreme Soviet are decided by an order from the defense minister. Hence the need to adopt a law on defense.

V. Volkov: In other words, we have finally realized that if we are going to create a rule-of-law state we will also need clear legal regulation with regard to defense building. Hence the decision to streamline our uncoordinated military legislation.

Correspondent: So the draft was initiated by the Defense Ministry. But who has actually written the law? You are, of course, aware that this question has often been asked in parliament, particularly when a draft law under discussion is too zealous in its protection of departmental interests. I would also like to know what channels the draft law has to go through and where work on it begins?

V. Strekozov: Yes, you are right. The Defense Ministry was responsible for initiating this draft law. However, I would like to debunk the opinion that the apparatus is exclusively involved in the appearance of many of our laws. Reports often creep into the press which claim that a department leader has given instructions, his subordinates have devised the law in their offices, and deputies have been presented with a *fait accompli*. That has never happened, not even in the bleakest years of the stagnation period. I say this with full responsibility.

The system that has evolved is as follows. Scientists and practical workers substantiate the need to adopt a legislative act. A working body is set up, which includes specialists and legal experts....

V. Volkov: That is also true of our law. It all began with numerous proposals from scientists and military legal experts, which basically came down to the fact that we needed to draft a law that would serve as the foundation for an entire system of military legislation. The realization of these theoretical proposals began after the 19th All-Union Party Conference adopted the resolution on legal reform. The Defense Ministry has set up its own military legislation commission, whose main task is to organize work to improve military legislation. This commission is headed by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister. Scientists from the Military Institute's Law Department have done a great deal of work on the draft law.

Every version of the draft law was sent for discussion to various ministries and departments and, of course, to the troops. The military legislation commission received more than 1,500 proposals from military districts and groups of forces for the latest—the third—version of the draft alone. All of them have been studied and considered, as have many enterprising drafts, incidentally.

Correspondent: Do other countries have this kind of law, or are we the trail blazers?

V. Strekozov: Most states—bourgeois and socialist—have this kind of law. We carefully studied the experience of all the main countries when preparing the draft.

Correspondent: What are the main, most vital points in the draft new law? Could it be termed revolutionary in the sense in which we attach this epithet to the recently adopted laws on ownership and basic principles of legislation on land?

V. Strekozov: My answer to your question is this. The main point is that, for the first time in the history of Soviet legislation, we have prepared a draft law which legally regulates all aspects of defense activity. Just listing its structural parts is evidence enough: "The Powers of Bodies of State Authority and Administration in the Defense Sphere," "The Responsibilities of Enterprises, Establishments, and Organizations in the Defense Sphere," and "Economic Back-Up for Defense." The section "The USSR Armed Forces and Other Troops" represents the first attempt in our legislative practice to establish the basic principles of the legal status of the Armed Forces and other paramilitary formations. The draft law also enshrines the relative status of the state of war, wartime, mobilization, martial law, and civil and territorial defense. Some of them were regulated before, but by secret and top secret orders from the USSR defense minister or by secret decrees and resolutions issued by the USSR Council of Ministers, which sometimes led to paradoxes. For example, everyone knows that civil defense exists and that it is a nationwide task. But there has not been a single open legislative act on civil defense. They have all been top secret. So how can we abide by the law if we do not know what it is?

The draft law also resolves other problems.

Correspondent: But who, figuratively speaking, presses the button?

V. Strekozov: Under the draft law, it is the USSR president. In his capacity as supreme commander in chief and as the person responsible for the country's security. The document stipulates that the USSR president "takes decisions as to countermeasures, orders the USSR Armed Forces to conduct military operations and use nuclear weapons, and sanctions nuclear tests."

V. Volkov: For the first time it is proposed to legislatively enshrine the fact that all union and autonomous republics and other autonomous formations, nations, and ethnic groups in the Soviet Union are obliged to jointly participate in the country's defense and ensure the fulfillment of all measures to strengthen it, working on the basis of all-union interests. This seems to me to be particularly relevant today.

V. Strekozov: The draft is also the first legislative enshrinement of the defensive nature of our military doctrine, which is particularly important both within the context of military building and in an international context. There is also another feature which I consider very important. The new draft law reflects the Soviet

Union's international legal obligations in the military sphere. It notes in a special section that, when organizing the country's defense and also during military operations, the Soviet Union observes the norms of the international treaties to which it is signatory.

V. Volkov: I would like to say a few words about whether the draft law could be called revolutionary. Yes, in a number of instances it is ahead of our present practice. For example, we have tried in the draft law to substantiate the possibility of Soviet citizens' performing alternative service (in a civilian environment) and also service under contract. I cannot say whether these provisions will be adopted, but they are contained in the proposed version.

V. Strekozov: Incidentally, the question of alternative service prompted a lively discussion during the Defense Ministry collegium debate. Although we are in fact already translating the possibility of alternative service into practice. Take military construction workers, for example.

V. Volkov: There is hardly any point today in arguing the case for and against the introduction of alternative service. We have signed and ratified a series of international conventions which provide for the possibility of this kind of service. We must now think about the procedure for introducing it and try to ensure that it does not become a loophole for those who simply do not want to do service but have no justification for not doing so.

V. Strekozov: I would like to remind you that alternative service for believers existed in our country until 1939 and was enshrined in the law. The procedure for this had been perfected. So we do have experience in this.

Correspondent: Vladimir Georgiyevich, you mentioned military construction workers and said that they essentially undergo alternative service. But that is hardly a good example, you must agree. A lot has been said lately about the service conditions of military construction workers in civilian departments....

V. Strekozov: I meant that they undergo service that does not involve the use of weapons. As far as their service conditions are concerned, it is well known that the Defense Ministry and the Main Military Prosecutor's Office have repeatedly officially raised the question of eliminating military construction units within the system of general civilian ministries and departments: It is there that they are used as free manpower. If you like, it is Trotsky's idea of labor armies wrongly interpreted and implemented by methods that could not be considered the best. That is what it is. I would like to believe that the Defense Ministry proposals will be put into practice.

Correspondent: We have come to what I believe to be one of the most important questions. What is the new law going to give to the individual? Does it contain any guarantees of social protection for military servicemen?

V. Volkov: Yes, in my view, the primacy of common human values is sufficiently fully reflected in the document. The article "USSR Citizens' Rights" enshrines the legal, social, and political protection of military servicemen and also of other citizens taking part in safeguarding the country's defense and establishes responsibility for violating these rights.

Correspondent: I would also like to ask you this. Cases where military servicemen are insulted and outrages committed against military symbols are not infrequent today in the Baltic republics, the Transcaucasus, and a number of other regions of the country. What does the new draft law have to say in this connection?

V. Volkov: I will refer directly to the document. The section "Responsibility for Violating Legislation on USSR Defense" states that actions preventing the USSR Armed Forces and other troops from fulfilling the duties incumbent on them, incitement to resist and oppose these forces and troops, public insults, and outrages against military symbols will entail liability in accordance with the law.

Correspondent: There is still a long way to go before the law is finally adopted. What, in your opinion, are the most vital features that need to be revised? What prompted the most active opposition during the discussion of the draft at the USSR Defense Ministry collegium session?

V. Volkov: Different, sometimes opposing opinions were expressed, for example, on the problems of economic back-up for defense. That is perfectly understandable. Everything we discuss ultimately depends on the economy. For example, who should meet the cost of various types of defense expenditure?

V. Strekozov: Let me give you just one example to make this problem more specific. Land in our country has always been allocated free of charge to meet defense needs. But now, in line with the adopted basic principles of legislation on land, the fundamental principle that land use must be paid for has been enshrined in legislation. Military financial experts have estimated that land allocated for defense needs will cost something in the region of R40 billion per year. But, as is well known, the military budget is R70 billion. So the question is: From what budget is money for land going to be taken? And who is going to finance elementary military training in schools, for example? Some believe that the state should pay for it, while others insist that part of the expenditure must be covered by local government bodies. These problems are still unresolved at present.

Correspondent: But can we expect all these problems to be resolved by the adoption of the USSR Law on Defense?

V. Strekozov: Of course not. The new law will simply lay the foundations for further improving legislation.

V. Volkov: The Defense Ministry recently approved the plan for draft legislation work. It envisages a whole series of new legislative acts being drafted in the near future: draft laws on universal military service and general military service, the military serviceman's status, martial law, and a number of other issues.

Correspondent: But would it not be better to adopt this whole package of military laws immediately, as they are all interconnected and stem from each other?

V. Strekozov: That opinion was voiced at the Defense Ministry collegium session. I share that opinion myself.

Correspondent: What channels must the draft law pass through now?

V. Volkov: The USSR Defense Ministry collegium has approved it in the main. After some revisions, the draft law will be sent for discussion to the USSR Council of Ministers. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security and other interested parliamentary committees and commissions will begin to work through it at the same time. We are hoping that it will be submitted for discussion to the fourth USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Report From Lubyanka on KGB's 'New Face'

PM0105085090 London ITV Television Network
in English 2100 GMT 27 Apr 90

[Video report from inside Lubyanka, KGB headquarters in Moscow, by ITN's Bill Neely, introduced as the "first European reporter to be allowed inside KGB Headquarters," on ITV's "News at Ten" program; report includes short interview with KGB Major General Aleksandr Karbaynov, who speaks Russian with superimposed English translation; no date given—recorded]

[Text] [Neely] KGB Headquarters: For decades a symbol of repression in the Soviet Union and espionage abroad. In its prison cells dissidents have been murdered; from here an army of agents spied on the West. Today the KGB is showing a new face: We were invited inside. The openness that has swept through every layer of Soviet society finally reached its secret police. Today it admitted to the crimes and executions plotted in these corridors and carried out by its men under Stalin—convenient scapegoats, perhaps, but the KGB was open about today's activities, too.

Major General Aleksandr Karbaynov of the KGB revealed for the first time that 700,000 people have been executed for political crimes since the Revolution and that 3.5 million have been repressed. Since Gorbachev came to power 30 spies have been arrested in the Soviet Union and all but a few executed. Under Gorbachev, the KGB is busier. "The more the activities of foreign spies have increased," he says, "the more our activities have increased, and over the past five years, we've uncovered more agents than in the previous fifteen." As for internal dissent:

[Karbaynov] We keep files on criminals, but mass files on ordinary people simply don't exist. You can say what you like against the state now: It's what you do that's important.

[Neely] The KGB's key task is state security, but it's now cracking down on smuggling, too. Officers showed us 2,500 Russian icons which they seized in two swoops on illegal exporters. The haul valued at 1.5 million pounds is one of many such seizures of church property, of drugs, of guns. The KGB is now cooperating with foreign intelligence agencies against Mafia and drugs barons inside the Soviet Union. The next step isn't far off.

[Unidentified KGB officer] We will be working with the Interpol later this year.

[Neely] As for the icons, the KGB is giving them back to the church. The image may have changed, but the activities directed from this building and the effectiveness of the officers who work here remain the same. The KGB remains one of the most powerful organs of Soviet society. Bill Neely, "News at Ten," at KGB headquarters in Moscow.

KGB Official Notes Easing of Border Regime

90UN1674A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 26 Apr 90 p 4

[Letter from reader T. Korolkova, Maritime Kray, and response from V. Simonenkov: "The Reliability of the Open Border"]

[Text] It was reported in one of the newspapers (I do not recall which one) that points were to be constructed on the Soviet-Iranian border for letting residents of the neighboring states through for visits. I am interested in whether these processes pertain only to Soviet-Iranian relations, or is a general tendency developing toward democratization of conditions on the border?

[Signed] T. Korolkova, Maritime Kray

"The processes of democratization and expansion of openness taking place in the country have directly affected the state borders of the USSR," Colonel Vitaliy Viktorovich Sakharov, deputy chief of the headquarters administration of border troops of the USSR KGB, said in a conversation with our correspondent. They are the result of the new political thinking and have already become irreversible. And we are not speaking about any individual sections, but the entire border."

Agreements similar to the one concluded with Iran have already been reached with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Mongolia. Now we have arranged closer ties with our southern neighbor. This has taken place in a short period of time—in 10 days of negotiations. I shall not conceal the fact that the sad events on the border in January were an additional impetus for the most rapid resolution of this issue. What am I speaking about, specifically? After the signing of two memorandums, USSR citizens with relatives in Iran

have been given the right to acquire a border passport. Ten days after it is received an exit permit is issued for a period of two months.

Residents of border regions who live in population points located no more than 45 kilometers from the border may visit the neighboring state four times a year through express points. These points are designated and named. There are a total of 11 of them on the territories of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkmenia. They are now just being created for it is necessary to create several traffic lanes for automobiles and a number of service buildings. The local authorities have been made responsible for this.

As concerns the filling out of documents, it has indeed become significantly simpler. Now residents who live in the 45-kilometer zone need only an ordinary citizen's passport, to which the local authorities attach an insert with the appropriate form. This is enough to let people across the border.

When speaking about the USSR state border, one cannot but mention another thing. In a number of places in the Far East, Maritime Kray, and Chita Oblast, as we know, there have been serious restrictions on the use by local peasant farms of productive land in the border strip. These restrictions have now been removed. Now practically everything there is resolved by the local authorities.

Engineering and technical facilities are being removed from large sections of the border. In the western section, the Far East, and Maritime Kray they have been removed from a stretch of more than 1,000 kilometers.

How is all this reflected in the condition of our border? When these measures were taken there was a small outburst of violations. Now their number—if one may put it this way—has returned to "normal." And what is the "norm?" An average of 2,000 attempted violations a year. So those who in the name of democratization are almost ready to disband the border troops should not be in too great a hurry.

Developments 'Reminiscent' of Germany in 30's

PM3004162090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No. 16, 17-23 Apr 90 p 23

[Viktor Kremenyuk article: "A Historical Parallel"]

[Text] To the historians who follow the progress of perestroika in the U.S.S.R., the current developments in this country are increasingly reminiscent of those in Germany at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s. Rampant democracy, the squabbles between the Left-wing parties, the embittered and humiliated army, the hungry workers....

There can be no question, of course, of mechanically equating the conditions and circumstances in one country with those in another one. The differences between them are all too obvious, I agree.

At the same time, there is no denying certain similarities between these conditions and circumstances, and certain historical parallels inevitably suggest themselves. The democratization now on in our society is as unhabitual to us as it was to the Germans of the twenties. The Germans then got rid of the Kaiser and got down to building the Weimar Republic; we are getting rid of Stalinist socialism and trying to build a free society. The Germans were demilitarized under the Treaty of Versailles; we came to realize the need for creating a civil society on our own accord. Versailles and postwar economic dislocation plunged Germany into economic chaos; we are now in the throes of a bad crisis. On the whole, what the current situation here and that in Germany way back in the twenties have in common is democratization against the background of economic collapse.

This appears extremely important to me, because the very democratization, demilitarization and deideologization of society and the building of a law-governed state cause discontent among a sizable part of the public. In the Germany of the twenties, discontent was widespread among army officers, petty property owners who had gone bankrupt and were in utter confusion, the younger generation, declassé World War I veterans.

Our own discontented include stagnation-period civil servants, who have lost their positions, bureaucrats apprehensive of radical reforms, servicemen dismissed from the armed forces because of arms and personnel cuts, factory and office workers who are being steadily impoverished by inflation. The longer our economic crisis lasts, the wider discontent will spread, with people increasingly tending to blame the reforms for their plight.

The situation is further aggravated by the growing frictions among our left. Before carrying through the reforms, dismantling the old system and making transformations irreversible, they have already divided and started vying with each other for votes. The successful slowing down of our reforms by those who do not like them is largely due to the division of the left-wing forces.

This is also reminiscent of the situation in Germany in the twenties. The antagonism between communists and Social Democrats was the fiercest then. Their battles, often fought over such issues as the "purity of Marxism" and "loyalty to principles," bled the potential base of democracy white, sowed mistrust in its ideals, weakened the resistance of the social organism to the bacilli of dictatorship. "Law and order" was one of the most attractive slogans of the time, and Nazism took advantage of it.

Over the twenties, the German right, right-wing nationalism, in particular, did not worry the public much. Hitler and his party were a laughingstock, their abortive "Kapp-Putsch" in Munich was made a joke of, and the Nazi movement was pronounced as good as dead.

The West looked on unperturbed. The winners of world War I were chiefly preoccupied with getting as much as possible out of the defeated enemy, with emerging from the hard crisis of 1929-32. It did not even occur to anyone that Germany would be able, under the leadership of a strong national party, to promptly restore its military potential and to become the source of another world conflict. Nevertheless, that was exactly what happened.

Our own right-wing nationalists do not cause much anxiety, either in or outside the country. Their escapades, slogans and programmes evoke scepticism, smiles, irritation, but nobody sounds the alarm. They are considered weak and denied any chance of winning a large enough following. I wish this complacency were well-grounded.

The whole thing is, however, that nationalism becomes dangerous in a poverty-stricken country. Tired of meat, housing and clothes shortages, disappointed with empty parliamentary talk, yearning for personal safety in the streets and in ethnic regions, the citizens of any country may finally lend an attentive ear to those playing on their national feels, urging them to defend their nation's and their country's honour, and promising them an immediate relief if, say, the "aliens" are driven out, to begin with.

That was what happened in Germany. Retribution was terrible. To regard German reunification now as dangerous is a bit naive. Real danger lies elsewhere—here. Our democracy, still in its growing pains, just cannot do anything about the economic crisis. It is exactly here that the standard of living keeps going down from year to year, with millions of factory and office workers being the worst hit. It is precisely here that crime is on the rise and inter-ethnic conflicts flare up. And it is here that right-wing nationalism, capable of covering the country up with concentration camps again and militarizing the nation wholesale, are already sprouting.

Our memories of the past do not only make us grieve over those who died on the battlefields of World War II and fell innocent victims of repressions. They demand that we should be vigilant against the dangerous processes underway abroad and at home. In this connection, it is always necessary to bear in mind the danger of the bacillus of nationalism, which turns humans—both individuals and masses—into beasts.

Deputy Lopatin's Expulsion From CPSU Examined

LD2904064890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0400 GMT 29 Apr 90

[Presented by Mayak Panorama announcer Aleksandr Ruvinskiy]

[Text] Another USSR people's deputy, Major Vadim Nikolayevich Lopatin, chairman of the Commission for Military Reform of the Committee on Defence and State Security Issues of the Supreme Soviet—there is such a commission in the committee—has recently been

expelled from the ranks of the CPSU. We have introduced you on several occasions to this people's deputy: He has taken part in Mayak programs—including our Panorama—and radio listeners will of course recall the honest and courageous speech he pronounced at the Second Congress of People's Deputies. Lopatin was one of the first to speak at the Congress in favor of cutting excessive military spending.

He demanded an open examination and investigation of the affair of the marshals' dachas, which were built at a cost of hundreds of thousands of rubles taken from the state exchequer—that is, out of our pockets. Both in the Kremlin and in the press, Lopatin has spoken frequently about the impermissibly wretched and beggarly living conditions of lower-ranking officers, and about the fact that such an army cannot have a high combat readiness.

Lopatin and the commission he heads drew up, in a very short period of time, a draft concept for military reform. I attended the Supreme Soviet committee sitting when this draft was being examined, and, incidentally, it emerged there that the military scientists who helped the Supreme Soviet to draw up this concept for military reform had serious troubles in the service.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA writes that Deputy Lopatin and his family rent a corner in someone else's apartment: so much for his privileges! Now he has been expelled from the party, although as far as we know, none of the military leaders for whom pleasant little palaces were built, using soldiers' labor at Gorkiy and (?Borvishche), has been expelled or in any way punished. No one has been punished, and yet the People's Control Committee has already ascertained what sums were spent at Gorkiy.

Lopatin, however, was nevertheless expelled. And as the newspaper says, one does not need to be a great politician to understand why and wherefore. The party conference of the Northern Fleet is to be held soon, which will elect delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. It should be added to all this that Vadim Nikolayevich Lopatin is very popular in the army: He has been nominated as delegate to the 28th Congress in five military units, and today in perhaps even more.

Meanwhile, dispatches are speeding from headquarters to the unit where Lopatin serves, which suggest that communists should without delay examine the issue of Lopatin's membership of the CPSU. It should be said that the party organization where Major Lopatin was registered categorically refused to examine this issue. Then this party organization was quite simply disbanded, by order. Major Lopatin, however, was instructed to register as a party member with the division administration, and the secretary of this party commission was instructed, of course, to examine the issue. Examine it they did, and expelled him, technically because since 4 January he has not been fulfilling his service obligations in the unit.

In order to appreciate the shameless charm of this formulation in its entirety, one needs to know that since 4 January Lopatin has been working as chairman of the Supreme Soviet commission. That is, in accordance with the law of the USSR, he is freed of his service duties while maintaining his average income. The meeting made the decision, however, even though Lopatin had been registered in that organization for just two days. Of course, Lopatin himself found out about the actions of high-ranking echelons of our Ministry of Defense—about his expulsion from the party—over the telephone, as the meeting took place without him.

The author of the article KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA raises a wholly legitimate question: Who will remain in the party if the Lopatins leave it?

Academy of Sciences Vice Presidents Elected

PM2704114690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian

26 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[I. Mosin report: "Vice Presidential Elections"]

[Text] The general assembly of members of the USSR Academy of Sciences continued work yesterday. Academy of Sciences President G. Marchuk proposed to the general assembly to examine as candidates for vice presidential posts Academicians Yu. Osipyan (physical and mathematical sciences); Ye. Velikhov (data processing, computer technology, power engineering); K. Frolov (engineering, mechanics, control processes); O. Nefedov (chemical sciences); R. Petrov (biological sciences); N. Laverov (earth sciences); V. Kudryavtsev (social sciences); and A. Logunov (liaison with higher education, scientific publishing activity).

In accordance with the established procedure, the candidacies of Academician V. Koptug, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department; Academician G. Mesyats, chairman of the Urals Department; and Academician Zh. Alferov, chairman of the Leningrad Scientific Center, were also put forward for vice presidential posts. The question of the election of a vice president from the Far East Department was postponed until the end of the year. G. Marchuk proposed that the candidacy of Academician I. Makarov for the post of chief academic secretary to the academy presidium be examined.

After discussions about some contenders, the general assembly agreed on the proposed candidates. According to the results of a secret ballot, all the candidates recorded the necessary number of votes, and so obtained the lawful right to become members of the presidential team.

Liberal Democrats Support Unity

LD2504090590 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT
25 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—"The Liberal-Democratic Party supports three forms of ethnic-administrative organisation in the settlement of ethnic issues—a unitary state, federation and confederation," Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the new Soviet Liberal Democratic Party, said in an interview with the MOSCOW NEWS weekly.

"For Russia this is the principle of a unitary state, for the Baltics and a part of Transcaucasia—the principle of confederation," he said.

Liberal Democrats oppose the disintegration of the Soviet Union, he said. "However, we do not support unity based on violence. The Liberal Democratic Party thinks the Lithuanian issue should be settled within the framework of present and newly-passed laws, legal acts and procedures," he explained.

Zhirinovskiy said he favours a go-slow approach.

No one prevented Lithuanian parliamentarians submitting a secession request to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The centre would then work on ways to let the republic go, he said.

Instead, Lithuania made a mistake, skipping this stage, he said.

Foreign Reviews of Yeltsin Book Quoted

PM2604092590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 24 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Roundup of TASS reports: "Secrets of the 'Confessional.' Foreign Press on Promotion of B.N. Yeltsin's Book"]

[Text] The Soviet press has already reported the publication of B.N. Yeltsin's book "To the End" [its French title; the book was published as "Against the Grain" in the UK and as "Confession" in Sweden] in the West. Our readers have been asking about its content.

Today we offer some Western press commentaries on the book "To the End," which has been promoted by the author in a number of West European countries.

London—The FINANCIAL TIMES printed an article by John Lloyd, who writes, in part:

Boris Yeltsin's autobiography is terrifying. When you read it you fear that the Soviet Union is incapable of creating a political class.

In his own words, Mikhail Gorbachev's chief opponent has neither program nor critical analysis, apart from the demagogic condemnation of privileges (he is very eloquent about this), and he has no useful ideas about the underlying causes of the grim situation in his country.

Yeltsin presents himself as a man who is bound to win votes because he is and always has been the people's friend. But few politicians deserve greater popular distrust than such a friend.

Yeltsin's story is the story of a guy from provincial Sverdlovsk who had a difficult childhood in the thirties. He grew up in a cramped room in a hut on a construction site where his father was a simple worker. Native wit and persistence got him through school and Polytechnical Institute and enabled him to occupy leading posts in construction and then in the Sverdlovsk party organization. At the age of 45 he became first secretary of the party obkom [oblast committee].

In this post, too, Yeltsin, as he himself says, was amazingly successful, working competently and acting in a resolute and highly moral way.

He talks in strong terms about corruption and stagnation. But Moscow's problems, which he says he saw with his own eyes on trips on the subway and visits to stores, were not solved, despite the fact that he worked 18 hours a day.

Yeltsin is increasingly critical in his descriptions of the cocoon in which he lived, talking very eloquently about the special stores, hospitals, food stores, cars, bodyguards and servants, and dachas.

He continues his criticism of party privileges (although he himself believes—at any rate, he did believe, when he wrote the book—in the party's monopoly of power and in Gorbachev) and of the deteriorating economic situation. However, Yeltsin evidently rarely feels the need to expound his own principles.

By and large, the group to which he belongs is apparently in favor of creating wider markets. But he is vague about this, devoting only half a page in a book of over 200 pages to the topic. He travels the world predicting disaster for perestroika and his country. He has a solid base of support: Discontent with perestroika is a popular slogan, and he latched on to it from the outset.

Claims that he got drunk during his trip to the United States and the reaction to the strange incident when he turned up soaked to the skin at a suburban police station possibly are indeed fabrications by his opponents, but they have done him a great deal of harm.

Boris Yeltsin may soon be president of the Russian Federation, filling an influential post from which he will be able to launch attacks on his rival.

Perhaps the Soviet Union—or, at any rate, Russia—will one day end up in the hands of this wily, vain man with an enormous thirst for power and adroitness in attaining his goal. But his autobiography does not suggest that Russia would be a better place as a result.

The 24-30 March issue of the magazine THE ECONOMIST contains the following review of B.N. Yeltsin's book:

Boris Yeltsin—maverick and volleyball enthusiast—would be Mikhail Gorbachev's only likely rival at the first free presidential elections in the Soviet Union. As Gorbachev's popularity declines, the question whether Yeltsin is suitable for the post becomes increasingly urgent. On the evidence of his book "Against the Grain" [Zapiski Neudobnogo Cheloveka], he is far better suited to winning the election than to being president. Boastful, overbearing, and bumptious, Yeltsin emerges by his own account as the eternal mocker of authority and very rarely as one who is capable of wielding it effectively.

Here is young Boris Nikolayevich fearlessly exposing his primary school teacher as a sadist; deprived of his right to secondary education by vengeful teachers, he successfully appeals over their heads and continues his studies. Here is honest Boris Nikolayevich completing his graduate dissertation in one month rather than the usual five, and then refusing the automatic promotion for which this would normally have qualified him, resolving instead to spend a year laying bricks, mixing concrete, and being among the workers on the construction site. Here we have brave Boris Nikolayevich facing up to a murderous convict who has been given work on a building site and is threatening foreman Yeltsin with an ax; sheer strength of will sends the man packing and the team completes the work on time.

Presumably, Yeltsin was doing all this in the name of some ideas or policies, but he barely mentions them. The impression is that he has not even thought, for example, about the future role of the Communist Party or the way in which elections, of which he is a living symbol, might shape a future Soviet Union. The impression is that the purpose of this book is to defend Yeltsin rather than to analyze a set of distinctive policies; it leaves the alarming impression that this man is performing admirable actions out of vanity.

Yeltsin, like Gorbachev, was born into a peasant family in the grim thirties, and his political maturity coincided with the beginning of Khrushchev's rule, when dawn was breaking after the long night of Stalinism. Now a generation of politicians is in power whose views were shaped not only by the Stalin dictatorship, but also by the failure of the first attempts at reforms. It would be very interesting to know more about the lessons Yeltsin has learned from this historical experience. Nevertheless, this experience, like the name Khrushchev, is barely mentioned in his book.

It is this inability to reflect and disinclination to make policy that has contributed to the failure of the Interregional Group of Deputies, an unofficial club of USSR people's deputies, to turn itself into an effective parliamentary opposition. Yeltsin is its best known member and probably the only one who could give it party discipline and a distinctive ideology. In fact, it has neither, and because of this Yeltsin himself is often underestimated.

Last September, by his own account, a sack was placed over his head and he was bundled into a car late one night and dumped in the Moskva River. An investigation by internal affairs organs found no evidence that this had happened. Yeltsin refused to press charges and, in front of the parliament, dismissed the events as a "joke." After such an incident most politicians' careers could be considered over. But now, six months on, Yeltsin is the main contender for the post of president of the Russian Federation, a post which, according to the logic of Gorbachev's decentralizing reforms, will become the second most important in the country.

Paris—A number of French papers have published lengthy reviews of the French translation of B.N. Yeltsin's book "To the End," published by Calmann-Levy.

"Yeltsin provides a self-portrait in which there is too much self-admiration," *LE MONDE* writes. In the paper's opinion, the book does not contain any program. The reader would be disappointed if he expected to find in it the author's vision of the future of the USSR. Nor are there answers—or else they are very vague—to questions about how to tackle ethnic problems and the mounting economic difficulties.

"The book's 276 pages do not give the reader an answer to the question what is this politician's program," *L'HUMANITE* writes. "Yeltsin, as portrayed by himself, is a man who is right, bold, straightforward, amiable, and competent in all things. At the same time, he lambastes all the CPSU leaders. The main burden of the book is constant criticism of the nomenklatura and its privileges. This criticism is not without foundations, but by and large it coincides with the criticism the CPSU is itself making."

"In the USSR at the moment there is genuine debate developing between the more or less open advocates of the capitalist path and those who support the democratic development of socialism," *L'HUMANITE* stresses. "Boris Yeltsin tries not to reveal his own views in order to secure the widest possible support."

"For the first time in history an apparatchik born of the Soviet system has broken with its traditional language of clichés," *LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS* notes. "Yeltsin talks about himself and others uninhibitedly and straightforwardly, but not without coquetry. His appearance on the USSR political stage more than anything else is evidence of the changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union." "But the phenomenal success he enjoys among the populace, winning election after election, overrunning everyone in his path, raises the question: How far will he go? To the end of what?"

Stockholm—B.N. Yeltsin held a press conference at the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute devoted to the publication of his book "Confession" by the Stockholm publisher "Forum." The book came out simultaneously in 15 countries and, as has been reported, is being prepared for publication in Russian in Riga and Leningrad.

Answering journalists' questions, B.N. Yeltsin dwelt, in particular, on the results of the elections to local organs of power on 4 March in the Soviet Union.

Talking about his attitude toward the institution of the presidency, B.N. Yeltsin noted: "I am not against the presidency. I said that 18 months ago. Our Interregional Group of Deputies also made a decision on this question. I am opposed to the haste with which this question is currently being decided. After all, we do not know what the president is supposed to preside over."

The following questions were asked: "In the present political conditions, what, in your view, should the Baltic republics do to achieve maximum independence? Should they throw down the gauntlet or bide their time? Do you think they will be able to secede from the Soviet Union?"

Answering them, B.N. Yeltsin said: "I favor maximum independence for the republics. I am in favor of Russia concluding a treaty on technical, economic, scientific, and cultural cooperation with Sweden. I would use this to define the level of independence, as it were. In the Baltic republics, of course, the situation is more complex.... They have moved more quickly from the viewpoint of democratization than society and the country as a whole. We legislators were not yet prepared for what they are prepared to do. So what is the upshot, either they are artificially curbed, or they violate the constitution? I believe they have chosen quite an interesting option, the best possible one. Since there is no special point in the constitution or law, they adopt a law that accords with their dynamic development, but does not accord with the constitution. Then the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, of which I am a member, meets and decides that the law adopted in a particular republic contradicts the constitution. But they act in accordance with their own law."

Asked what Sweden should do to help the Baltic republics, B.N. Yeltsin said: "Sweden is subtly and skillfully supporting the Baltic republics."

National-International Security Fund Formed

LD2804181390 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 28 Apr 90

[By TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—A mass organization was set up in the Soviet Union today to promote the elaboration of policies in areas that were traditionally the domain of party and state structures.

The Fund of National and International Security plans to unite public, state and international structures to prevent and tackle any kind of conflict in today's turbulent and interdependent world.

As inter-ethnic and other conflicts escalate, the fund seeks to forecast negative processes and trends, and to help public forces and official authorities achieve and

preserve stability, national reconciliation and accord. Provisions are also made for the fund's participation in similar international programmes.

The fund's organisers believe that the system for adopting important political and practical decisions in the Soviet Union lacks an important link: independent experts and independent public control in national and international security. The new fund should significantly reduce the risk of authorities taking misdirected decisions.

Major General Leonid Shershnev was elected president of the fund. The general, who entered Afghanistan in 1979 with the first Soviet troops, later became one of the most vociferous opponents of Soviet involvement in this war. He expressed his views in 1984 to the then Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko, damaging his career.

Economic, Social Reform Fund Created in Moscow

LD2904083890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 29 Apr 90

[Text] An economic and social reform fund has been established in Moscow. Its founders are production associations, enterprises and unions of cooperative workers and lease-holders. The aim of the new all-Union organization—it is called Reforma [Reform]—is to combine the efforts and material resources of those interested in accelerating the implementation of the programs of perestroika. The founding conference passed the rules of the organization. A supervisory council and its chairman—Academician Shatalin, member of the USSR Presidential Council—were elected.

Preschool Institution Workers Plan Strike

PM2404130990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 p 1

[Report by V. Sanatin: "Creches Strike Too"]

[Text] The strike movement of children's institution workers looks like becoming an all-union one. Following the Moscow kindergarten teachers, the Sverdlovsk teachers have organized strike committees. The Urals machine building plant committee has been joined by employees of Sverdlovsk's Leninskiy and Kirovskiy rayons and Bereзовskiy, Bogdanovich, Sukhoy Log cities... Actions are being coordinated between the teachers of Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, and Perm. Political and economic demands are being drafted which will be sent to the government in the next few days.

As a temporary measure the strike committees suggest the immediate review of all funds channeled by ministries and departments into the development of preschool children's institutions.

Whether we want it or not, the strike committees are preparing for warning regional strikes and if dialogue with the government is unsuccessful the strike may develop into an all-union one.

The strike committees include local soviet deputies and trade union leaders.

Hospital Patients Publish Strike Demands

90US0836A Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian No 16, 18 Apr 90 p 2

[Report by S. Sorokin and P. Shevchenko: "Strike at Preventive Treatment Facility"]

[Text] Some 450 people being held for compulsory treatment for alcoholism at LTP-10 [Preventive Treatment Center] (Chervonapartizansk City, Sverdlovskiy Rayon, Voroshilovgrad Oblast) declared a strike. At the same time, they also refused to eat.

The strikers were protesting "human rights violations" in the LTP system and submitted a package of demands to the administration.

What do those being treated in the LTP want from the country's highest legislative organ? Above all, abolition of censorship of correspondence and of the 30-percent deduction from the patients' wages, the transfer of the LTP from the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Health, and limitation of the time spent in treatment to six months. It is curious that many of the demands of the strikers coincide to a considerable degree with the points of the pre-election program of Major General of the Militia E. Didorenko, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy and chief of the oblast internal affairs administration.

During the course of the negotiations, representatives of the oblast internal affairs administration and the procuracy resolved on the spot a large share of the issues raised by the strikers. But it was impossible to resolve some issues because of legislation that is in effect. Therefore, a general meeting of the strikers adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet, after which those in attendance went back to work.

"If before 1 May we do not receive news that our appeal has reached the Supreme Soviet," Ye. Turbol, one of the strikers, told me, "and has been accepted for consideration, we shall be forced to resume our strike and refusal to accept food."

Soviet Germans Protest Anti-German Campaign

LD2604122790 Moscow *World Service* in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] A plenum of the Vozrozhdeniye association of Soviet Germans has sent an open letter to Aleksandr Sukharev, USSR general procurator. It says that an organized anti-German campaign has been waged recently in Saratov and Volgograd Oblasts. Local mass

media, in which chauvinistic articles are appearing, are being used to this end. Mass meetings are also being staged regularly, at which speeches are made insulting the national dignity of Soviet Germans. Local authorities are not taking any steps to stop the actions of people who are inflaming interethnic discord. We request that measures be adopted to protect the legitimate rights of Soviet Germans, and that the organizers and participants in the anti-German campaign, whose actions could lead to unpredictable consequences, be punished, says the message.

Ban on 'Personalized' Media Ownership Backed

PM2704112790 Moscow *PRAVDA* in Russian 26 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Professor V. Gorokhov: "How the Right Is Ensured: We Discuss the Draft Law on the Press and Other Mass Media"]

[Excerpts] Moscow—[passage omitted] There are weaknesses and contradictions concerning actual journalists and their multifarious activity. Article 1 proclaims: "The press and other mass media are free. Censorship of the mass media is not permitted." You want to applaud that thesis, since it expresses an acute social need and the drafters' striving for the ideal, so to speak.

Here it is important not only to proclaim the freedom of the press but also to clearly point out the legal and political guarantees of it contained in the democratic structure of our socialist society undergoing renewal.

Freedom and responsibility are, as is well known, two sides of the same coin. While rejecting ideological censorship, society cannot forsake the instrument which enables it to regulate mass media activity. The draft law talks about this legal instrument in Article 5, which warns against "abuse of press freedom." The term "abuse" in a document of this level is scarcely appropriate. It should rather be a question of the mass media's responsibility. It is essential to present here in Article 5 the whole spectrum of the generalized features of the content of the proposed judicial responsibility of organs of the press, radio, and television, for, for example, deliberate disinformation and so forth. [passage omitted]

The publication of two articles—Articles 6 and 42—with alternative wordings should, in the drafters' opinion, be regarded as a notable feature of the draft. The crux of the problem in Article 42 is the recognition or nonrecognition of the right of a founder and publisher to interfere in the activity of mass media falling "under their jurisdiction." We are here talking about the extent of an editorial office's political and professional autonomy. At the same time the actual draft has provided an entirely clear-cut solution to this question: Article 11 says that the founder and publisher may halt a news agency's activity. But if such an argument is in dispute, what is the point in wrangling over particulars and details?

The dispute in Article 6 is over the establishment of mass media. And while one wording of the article recognizes such a right to organizations and citizens of the USSR, the other considers a personalized right unacceptable. Imagine that the right to establish a press, radio, or television organ is granted to any USSR citizen. Then among a number of other requirements laid down by the law he will have to show on registration the publishing house or television or radio station, his newspaper or program ready for publishing or transmission, and also the source of his finance (Article 7). The inevitable question is: Who personally will be able to produce such sources? In any event group capital, concealed or otherwise, will lie behind the aforesaid citizen, and the person who aspires to enter the mass media will represent an organization—recognized or unrecognized, formal or informal. That is to say, the personalized right will merely serve to camouflage or conceal the right of an organization.

Nor can one discount the fact that a personalized right will inevitably lead to disorganization, chaos, and an unpredictable situation in a sphere that requires from the people involved in it the highest sense of social responsibility. Therefore, in my view, the stance adopted by those in the dispute over Article 6 who oppose the granting of the right to establish mass media to individual citizens is a more accurate and productive one.

The press is, people will know, respectfully referred to as the "fourth estate" (after the legislature, executive, and judiciary). Today we are engaged in giving legal form to this estate. And everything must be done to ensure that this estate is just, sensible, and effective.

'April' Written Group Ends Constituent Congress

LD3004093190 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT
30 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—The April organization, set up by Moscow men of letters a year ago, held a constituent congress, which ended its two-day work in Moscow on Sunday.

The association's statute says that April seeks to unite all democratic forces in Soviet literature. It advocates full creative freedom and competition between artistic viewpoints and styles.

The association intends to operate within the USSR Union of Writers but with the status and rights of a legal entity.

The congress also approved April's rules.

Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Vitaliy Korotich, Anatoliy Pristavkin, Vladimir Sokolov, and Yuriy Chernichenko were elected the April Association's cochairmen.

Cooperative Ventures Stir Social Tension

LD2804163990 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT
28 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—Cooperative ventures have stirred up unprecedented social tension in the Soviet Union, it was noted today at the USSR Procurator's Office collegium meeting, presided by USSR General Procurator Aleksandr Sukharev.

The collegium discussed the state of the procurator's supervision over observance of legislation regulating the cooperative movement in the Soviet Union and upholding the rights and interests of citizens who use the services of cooperatives.

It was noted that the cooperative movement is sabotaged by officials who are responsible for its development and support. However some cooperatives commit illegal actions themselves.

Local authorities often accept decisions contradicting Soviet law on cooperation and limit citizens' rights to set up cooperatives. They artificially complicate the registration process, interfere in the cooperatives' activities, impose exorbitantly large taxes and even illegally close cooperatives.

Bribing state authorities to receive accommodation, scarce materials, financing and raw materials is wide spread. About 250 proceedings were instituted against bribetakers last year.

Multiple violations of laws on the part of cooperatives were also described at the meeting. Law enforcement bodies have evidence of money laundering and tax evasion. Some 8,000 crimes for mercenary motives were revealed in 1989, costing some R100 million.

The USSR general procurator demanded that subordinate procurators actively supervise cooperative legislation and eradicate illegal acts by cooperatives and enterprises, organisations and institutions with respect to cooperatives.

The collegium determined practical moves to raise the efficiency of supervision over the cooperative movement.

Solzhenitsyn Royalties Slated for Monastery

PM0305084190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "For Restoration of Solovki"]

[Text] Arkhangelsk—Nobel Prize winner writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has ordered that his Soviet royalties for the publication of his books—about R2 million—be put toward the church fund for the restoration of the Solovetskiy monastery, the Arkhangelsk and Murmansk eparchy administration has announced.

Years later the works of Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn have returned to the writer's Fatherland. He devoted a considerable part of his main lifework, "The Gulag Archipelago," to a study of the history of the special camps on the Solovetskiye Islands in the White Sea. A terrible model for Stalin's camps was "run in" here in the early twenties on the site of the former Solovetskiy monastery.

The Solovki are called the "pearl of the White Sea." The six large and many small islands forming an archipelago are distinguished by their mild sea climate and northern nature of remarkable beauty. The first settlements here date back to the third millennium BC. Since the 15th century the Solovki have been one of the centers of Russian Christianity. The 16th century Solovetskiy fortress architectural ensemble has been recognized as a cultural monument of world importance.

Nonetheless the fate of the Solovki is tragic. Tsarist Russia had long used them as a prison. Soon after the victory of Soviet power the monastery on the archipelago was eliminated and the monastery's property was nationalized. The islands in the Arctic Circle were destined to become the birthplace of the Gulag.

Not only people but also masterpieces by ancient artists were pulverized between the cruel millstones. The restoration of the Solovetskiy monastery has been under way for over 25 years. Millions of rubles have been spent on saving the ensemble but, alas, to this day not one of the monuments has been completely restored.

The church recently asked the country's government to hand over the monastery complex on the Solovetskiye Islands to its age-old owner—the Russian Orthodox Church. It intends not simply to restore the Solovki in all their beauty, but also to breathe life into the monument. That is why the oblast society for the conservation of monuments of history and culture has agreed to the Russian Orthodox Church coming to the Solovetskiye Islands and opening the monastery. A religious community has been registered there. It has been given one of the churches.

Correction to Part Two of Yakovlev Interview

LD0205125790

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "Yakovlev Interviewed on Presidential System" published on page 56 of the 1 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

page 56, column one, last paragraph, first sentence make read: ...au courant with the discussions of this entire gamut of problems both before the... (rewarding for clarity);

same paragraph, sentence five make read: ...this attracts people. Let us now reflect on this. Why, in fact?... (clarifying sentence);

same paragraph, antepenultimate sentence make read: ...each of their doctrines or concepts... (deleting extraneous word "new");

column two, paragraph two, sentence five make read: ...in the reaction. Look how the intelligentsia reacted to the year 1956, with the new poets.... (retranslating);

same paragraph, antepenultimate sentence make read: ...precisely, not earlier? What could we mention now? That's how it... (rewording);

paragraph three, only sentence make read: [Plevako] At any rate, it does not bear comparison with what existed in [words indistinct] years.

[new graf] [Yakovlev] It's impossible.... (partially clearing indistinct question);

paragraph four, third sentence make read: ...among the intelligentsia. It is as though some shadowy aspects... (retranslating);

same paragraph, sentence sixteen make read: ...to Stalin, some would not be adverse to the monarchy... (retranslating);

page 57, column one, paragraph one, first sentence make read: ...of an educator, of some sort of guiding light whose accounts could be believed and respected. And here, you see, everything has turned out somewhat differently, and... (retranslating, clearing indistinct words);

paragraph three, last sentence make read: ...1,000 years of the paradigm of existence devoid of democracy and, in essence, devoid of true freedom, a few protests apart; one which trampled underfoot man's dignity.

[new graf] [Plevako] In connection with the fact that you have been appointed a Presidential Council member, allow me to ask you several questions. To what extent, in your view, is the Presidency capable of resolving problems which neither the government, nor the parliament, nor the Central Committee have so far been able to resolve during the course of the first year of Perestroika?

[new graf] [Yakovlev] As our president... (clearing indistinct words, correcting passage mistakenly attributed to Yakovlev);

column two, third paragraph, sentence four make read: ...dissatisfaction is higher. This is simply because people have begun to speak about it and it is not as though there was no justification for it. So we must change our housing policy. We must create a housing market. We must concern ourselves with low paid people, with pensioners, so that they do not suffer in all this. Let us now take, say, the questions of law and order. I have at the moment an instruction from the president to coordinate all this work by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB, as it were, the Procuracy and... (clearing indistinct words, rewording);

same paragraph, sentence fourteen make read: the better one.

[new graf] [Plevako] Whichever one is better is better.

[new graf] [Yakovlev] That is indeed better.... (correcting sentence erroneously attributed to Yakovlev);

same paragraph, penultimate sentence make read: ...where everything is done, sown and harvested, by outside forces... (adding omitted words).

Economic

Market Economy 'Essential' for European Integration

PM3004095590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksey Pushkov article: "In Proud Isolation? Only After Creating a Full-Blown Market Will We Be Able To Enter the 'Common European Home'"]

[Text] What connection is there between our country's position in the world and a market economy? The most direct one: If we do not go over to a full-blown market, including private enterprise, we will not only fail to emerge from our very profound economic and social crisis but will be unable to enter the "common European home" that is under construction. The absence of a market economy as an essential element of European integration cannot be compensated for by any diplomatic efforts.

The development of events in East Europe, where the accelerated movement toward political pluralism has entered the election phase, forces us to put this question so starkly. Parties unambiguously orientated toward a liberal market model of development have been victorious in the GDR and Hungary. A substantial reduction in the state's role in the economy and the privatization of the bulk of industry—around 80 percent—is planned in Poland and Hungary. It is intended to put around 7,000 enterprises in the GDR into private ownership in the near future.

Judging by all appearances, things are headed in the same direction in other states in the region too, where those who advocate priority for social ownership are on the defensive. The most the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia can hope for in the country's June elections is 15 percent. A few more voters—17.5 percent—supported the communists in the recent republic elections in Slovenia. The Czechoslovak parliament has already adopted a resolution placing state, private, and cooperative enterprises on an equal footing. The radical restructuring of the economy, with the restoration of the rights of private enterprise, forms an integral part of the programs of the overwhelming majority of the political movements—from social democrats to conservatives—operating in East European countries.

Given this, a deep rift is developing between the organizational and functional principles of the economy of our country and those of the majority of countries of East Europe. This rift is very dangerous for us. We used to exist in quasi-isolation from the world economy, but we did remain nevertheless within the framework of the so-called socialist community. Now, however, we risk—with our loyalty to "socialist principles of economic management"—being left in proud isolation.

We will, of course, retain a certain, quite large volume of trade with our neighbors. After 40-odd years of particularly close cooperation it would be foolish, indeed impossible, to break with national economies which in many regards complement our own. However, the trends are alarming. Take cooperation with Czechoslovakia. For the time being we remain its primary foreign trading partner (30.1 percent of turnover in 1989). But that same year Czechoslovak exports to the USSR fell by 7.3 percent and imports by 2.6 percent. And, according to Czechoslovak estimates, this negative dynamic is not going to change in subsequent years. At the same time, we do see a steady westward reorientation of East European countries' economic ties. Czechoslovakia's exports to the West rose by 16 percent last year.

It is time to ask ourselves an unpleasant question: What are we intending to take with us into Europe, into the "common European home"? Let us not talk about the present state of our economy—that would, as it were, be a blow below the belt. But let us ask, at least: with what kind of economic concepts, approaches, and structures? With a coy, ambiguous recognition of the permissibility of "individual economic activity"? With ideological incantations regarding the unacceptability of exploitation which, as it is, already exists in the most extreme state forms? And with a patently unviable mutant of a "planned market economy"?

In the political sphere we certainly do have something to offer Europe. Above all, a desire for good-neighborliness, cooperation, a lowering of the level of military confrontation, the demilitarization of the continent, and disarmament. Moreover, so far as the security of the continent is concerned the other European countries can in no way do without the Soviet Union. Our very geopolitical situation and military might make us an indispensable and leading participant in the all-European process. In terms of culture, genuine culture, that is, rather than its ideological surrogates, our country has always been inextricably linked to Europe. In the scientific sphere we have something to give and something to gain. However, all this still does not make us an integral part of the European economic organism that is being created. In this sphere we can offer our continental neighbors only raw materials, energy sources, and an enormous but completely unprepared and "indigestible" market. As far as raw materials are concerned, we sold them in the past and are selling them now—and in large quantities; and clearly, for want of anything better, we will continue to do so; but that does not take us a single step closer to the European processes of integration. Our market does

have potential, that is to say, it contains within it purely hypothetical opportunities. Despite the claims of our latter-day isolationists who shout about the "auctioning off of the homeland," no one is yet in any particular hurry to take it on. Western capital is clearly not making a beeline toward us.

You often hear the following: Differences in the bases and forms of the organization of economic life should not hinder the development of mutually beneficial economic cooperation. Perhaps, according to some logic, they should not; but in fact they do, and in a very decisive manner. It is time to do away once and for all with the myth that the Soviet state's autarky after the civil war was the result of economic boycott, the hostility of capitalist powers, the creation of a "cordon sanitaire," and so forth. All this, of course, did occur (although the economic blockade was lifted by Britain, France, and Italy as early as 1920). The main reason, however, was different, to wit, our country's switch over to principles of economic management which inevitably condemned the USSR to drop out of the world economy. And thus we have remained outside its ambit until now, despite all attempts to establish stable economic links with the leading powers of Europe. The experience of the East European countries also bears out the fact that the statization of the economy combines ill with economic liberalism and the international market and that state enterprises establish contact with private ones only with difficulty.

This pattern continues to operate in full measure today. Of the 1,500 formally created joint ventures in the USSR, no more than 50 are actually operating. The remaining weak shoots of joint business are crushed by our bureaucratic Moloch.

Moreover, the basic conditions required for their activity and for the attraction of foreign investment are lacking. There are no modern telecommunications or other means of communications in situ for computer and information technology operations; there is no access to reliable data on economic indicators, which rules out realistic analysis of capital investment risks; there is no effective, rapid system of confirming decisions in the sphere of joint projects; basic financial and technical services and so forth are not provided. That is to say, we lack everything necessary for the extensive entree of Western businessmen. And until we are able to meet those conditions, our integration in the world economy will stop at the level of McDonalds and individual projects in the sphere of industry, which are not enough to remove us from the economic backwater of Europe. And it is very doubtful that our sluggish, antediluvian, brontosaurus-like ministries, which are mainly interested in serving their own ends, will be able to solve all these problems.

Let there be no illusions: The foundation of the single European home—if we are talking about it seriously and not in propaganda terms—can only be a uniform economy or, at any event, one built on similar market

principles, which have already demonstrated their effectiveness. Setting themselves the task of "returning to Europe," they are beginning to lay the economic and material foundations for that return.

The last thing I want to do is underestimate the economic and social difficulties which our East European neighbors still have to face on this path. Poland is burdened with a debt of 40 billion, Hungary's is 18 billion. Problems await even the relatively prosperous industrial countries, such as Czechoslovakia with its outmoded production capital (60 percent obsolete or worn out), one of the highest production consumption levels in Europe, and a potential for extensive development that is completely exhausted.

By all accounts, the West Europeans do not relish the prospect of seeing these countries, with their largely backward economies, in the EEC either. However, some form of associate membership of the Community will be found, apparently, to the extent that they restructure themselves "in line with Europe," give priority to private economic activity, and reduce state intervention in the economy.

The new structures of regional economic cooperation that are coming into being are also noteworthy. The formation of an "Alpine-Adriatic Association" consisting of Austria, Hungary, Italy, and Yugoslavia has already been announced: Czechoslovakia has recently decided to join. The idea of creating a Central European alliance put forward at the recent meeting of Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Polish leaders in Bratislava for the purpose of the "joint movement of these countries into Europe" is also significant.

All this does not mean, of course, that we should immediately introduce a Western-style market economy in our country and proclaim the principles of neoliberalism. That is impossible. That isn't the issue: What is vitally needed is a real and progressive movement toward a market and the deideologization of the economy. If we continue to mark time in the future, too—and the likelihood of that is quite great—the result will be a new curtain between the USSR and the rest of Europe, only this time an economic one.

It may be claimed, as ever, of course, that the whole world is wrong and we alone are right. That it is on the wrong track—that of private enterprise and exploitation—whereas we are on the "only right" track. But would it not be better to consider the fact that virtually everyone is going in "that" direction? Even Vietnam and China, which permit no hint of political or ideological pluralism, are developing market relations, private property, and free zones.

Quite recently, Jacques Delors, president of the EC Commission, shared his vision of a future Europe comprising three concentric circles: at the center—the EEC, next the EFTA states, then the East European countries

in some form of association with the other two. But will we not be left outside even the third circle, on the very edge of Europe?

Historically, Russia has always found it difficult to associate with the rest of the continent. Indeed, its entire history in the 18th-19th centuries was one of conflict between two principles in its development—pro-European and anti-European. In 1917 the choice was made against Europe. At that time there were hopes of a world revolution, a complete renewal of the world. Today we face a different task: integration in the international economy and a return to civilization in political and economic relations. And we rightly disapprove of all attempts to separate our country from Europe and arguments that Europe ends at the Soviet border. Well, there are indeed quite a few opponents of our entry into Europe. But our main enemy is within ourselves. Either a market that really works or a new illusion—there is no third course.

Agricultural

Peasant Union Should 'Control' Farming Sector

PM3004142790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by USSR People's Deputy A. Aydak, member of the organizing committee to create the Peasant Union and chairman of the "Leninskaya Iskra" Collective Farm, under the rubric "Deputy's Position": "Peasants Congress Being Prepared by...Apparatus"]

[Text] The second session of the organizing committee to hold the constituent congress of the USSR Peasant Union was held 18 April. Two different approaches to the future organization's activity were defined during the discussion of the Peasant Union's draft statutes. The first is that the union will virtually be an appendage of the existing apparatus for directing the agrarian sector. Here, as previously, the peasantry is allocated only the role of an "instrument" in resolving the food problem.

The second approach, conversely, places the entire agro-industrial apparatus from bottom to top under the control of the Peasant Union. This approach will, I believe, ensure the real possibility of defending the interests of the country's agrarian sector, because it is based on recognition of the peasantry's intrinsic value, which we have forgotten about for many decades.

It is no wonder that the "apparatus option" was insistently defended at the organizing committee session by G. Kulik, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Food and Purchases Commission. Despite all my respect for him, I wish to point out that it is a dubious thing for an apparatus leader to be so zealously setting about creating a public organization.

At the organizing committee session and at a meeting of agrarian deputies at the Third Congress of Soviets a

majority advocated granting the Peasant Union the status of a sociopolitical organization. However, the Peasant Union's draft statutes, published recently in SELSKAYA ZHIZN, state that it is merely a public organization. However, the Philatelists Union is also a public organization. Whereas our tasks are a bit more serious. The definition of the Peasant Union as a sociopolitical organization still does not make it a party, but it opens up possibilities for this. Because it is obvious that if the country's leadership and the CPSU fail to express the peasants' true interests, the creation of a peasant party will become an urgent necessity.

Something else is clear too. With the creation of the Peasant Union the present kolkhoz [collective farm] councils become unnecessary. Nevertheless, the opinion prevailed at the organizing committee that representatives of kolkhozes must meet once again after the constituent congress of the Peasant Union and decide the question of this organ's future. Why? The question could be decided in principle at the very first, constituent congress of the Peasant Union, because the kolkhozes will also be represented there.

A majority of members of the organizing committee also advocated holding a congress of the Peasant Union once every five years, as provided for in the draft statutes. It is said that this will cost a lot. This, in my view, is the totally wrong approach. Our times are so dynamic that one year now is quite comparable with five previously or maybe even with a whole decade. If the peasants meet once every five years, the work of their union will become a formality.

It is also a mistaken opinion that the agrarian deputies of soviets at various levels can ensure the protection of the peasantry's interests. I have been involved right from the start—since the First Congress of Soviets of People's Deputies—in organizing the movement of agrarian deputies, and I am convinced that they cannot. The point is that, given the present organizational forms, agrarian deputies will still lack decisiveness and cohesion. They need their own organization, which will make it possible to form a strong faction in parliament. And the Peasant Union cannot manage without its own press organs.

Orel Reduces Beet Area; 'Big' Harvest Expected

PM2604124390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 25 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading: "In Russia's Spring Fields"]

[Text] Orel—Having completed the sowing of early feed and spring crops, the oblast's farmers have embarked on the second campaign. All beet-sowing regions have started mass sowing of the main industrial crop—sugar beet. This year it will occupy a smaller area than usual. But experience has shown that this will not lead to a reduction in the harvest of this valuable raw material for sugar refineries. All 60,000 hectares of beet this year are

being cultivated by lease collectives using intensive methods. A big harvest will be obtained by growing the plants closer together.

Scientific

Academician Criticizes Radiation Hazard Guidelines

LD2704180990 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT
27 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 27 TASS—When the Chernobyl disaster occurred, Soviet scientists thought they had enough knowledge to control the situation. On the contrary, the effect of even small doses of radiation on people living in the contaminated zone has at times unpredictable consequences, Professor Yelena Burlakova, chairperson of the Scientific Society on Radiobiology of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told TASS.

She said that the incidence of leukemia has recently increased among residents of a number of districts in Belorussia, the Ukraine and Russia to which discharge of the Chernobyl explosion spread.

Burlakova criticized the concept that a lifetime dosage of 33 rem is permissible. This figure served as the basis for permitting people to reside in contaminated areas.

This figure has not taken into account differences in sensibility to radiation due to age or other individual differences. Scientific research over the past four years shows that children are much more sensitive to radiation than adults.

Only consequences of irradiation such as acute or chronic radiation sickness were taken into account when 35 rem was designated as acceptable level. Studies completely ignored the consequences of disturbing the immune system and the increased tendency to develop various diseases, including cancer.

The danger of radiation is aggravated by the fact that its consequences can affect the progeny of persons who were subjected to radiation only once.

Burlakova said the authors of the 35 rem concept did not consider the fact that existing equipment cannot establish if a person received a dosage of 35 rem. In addition they have not considered the scope of radionuclide contamination in many districts, the living conditions of people in contaminated areas and the unsatisfactory medical service.

The increased incidence of disease is connected not only with irradiation as such, but also with ecological and psychological factors.

It is difficult to make any predictions at present. All factors should be considered before drawing conclusions, Professor Burlakova said. Decision-making should be based on the results of scientific research.

Chernobyl 24-Hour Telethon; Ryzhkov Message

LD0105094390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2000 GMT on 25 April carries a 24-hour telethon for the benefit of Chernobyl. The program is presented from the Rossiya Concert Hall.

The program opens in darkness apart from candles held by children. There are peals of bells and choral singing. The program presenters introduce a mixture of musical items, speeches by contributors, video clips illustrating the events at Chernobyl this day four years ago. Under the heading 'Reportage From 1986,' each of these video clips is one-minute long. The video then illustrates the present plight of sufferers and relatives under the heading 'From the National Disaster Zone.' The presenters, contributors, and victims are highly critical of the slow response at the time of the disaster and the inadequacy of subsequent efforts. Deformed babies born since the disaster are shown. A sequence of pictures repeated periodically carries the following captions: 150,000 people who worked to eliminate the consequences of the disaster urgently need medical assistance; 260,000 local inhabitants urgently need resettling; 3,883,000 people are living on radiation-polluted territory. Participants include Academician Velikhov and professor Kapitsa. Guests from the United States and Japan, representing contributing organizations, also appear. Under the heading 'From the History of the Sickness,' there is a report from a Kharkov hospital where the patients are on hunger strike in an attempt to gain official recognition that their sufferings are due to the Chernobyl disaster. The program includes some advertisements from sponsoring organizations.

The second six-hour block of the program continues along the same lines. 'The National Disaster Zone' items include one about a resettlement area that subsequently became affected by radiation, and one on people suffering from radiation particles in the lungs, which causes lung cancer. The 'History of Radiation Sickness' feature primarily tells of the fate of people who helped in the clearing up work, and one features an indignant but unnamed major general who has written a book about the initial cover-up and the tragedies that resulted from it. Various guests present cash contributions, ideas, and equipment. There is an item from a Prip'yat school where all the children undergo constant radiation checks. Dr. Gale of the United States is interviewed. Songs and dances continue.

In the third six-hour period, the program continues in a similar vein. Some of the interviews and reports are repeats from earlier in the program. New material includes an item on the Ukrainian system for monitoring the population. Equipment at hospitals is said to be woefully inadequate. There is a report on a meeting at the Soviet Embassy in London of eminent British people supporting the telethon. A message from William Waldgrave is read out. Later, in the Moscow studio, a list of

British contributors to the fund is read. More contributors of cash, equipment, and ideas are interviewed. A woman raising funds for the fund on American television is shown.

In the final six hours, the program continues as before. It includes an item on the use of hemosorbents and enterosorbents to help eliminate radiation from the system. Soviet patients undergoing checks in a Japanese hospital are shown. In the disaster zone, milk produced is regularly checked for radiation. A group of people interviewed included cosmonaut Major General Gorbalko, Academician Velikhov, and Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy. Infant mortality from radiation effects is said to be increasing at the Minsk hematological center.

Next the telethon presenter notes, "here is a special address from Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman." Nikolay Ryzhkov then addresses the telethon, saying, "We must not forget those people who did everything to liquidate the disaster. Of course, the consequences will be very prolonged. Four years ago, however, when the disaster happened, there was no experience. Those people who worked at that time—scientists, production workers, firemen, servicemen, civilians, they of course did everything. If it is said today that someone caused this deliberately, I do not accept this. I was chairman of the Commission for Eliminating the Disaster. The Politburo set up this commission on 29 April, and I know how responsibly these people worked. Scientists like Velikhov, the late Legasov—he was a really clever man, brilliant, and he did a great deal to recommend the government to take the right decisions. We could not do without science, we could not have taken decisions at that time. It was something quite new for us, and for the whole world it was something quite new, and those people did a lot. Look at the heroism of the firemen, those boys who now lie here; they knew what they were facing. Then the whole union was roused. One must not underestimate the moral cohesion of the people, when we were really doing everything by the bell in our country. I must say this is a very great tragedy, but in those conditions, much was done, and that makes it possible to judge our union again. Imagine if there had been no union, imagine there were no union republics. That is unrealistic, unrealistic. It would have been just as unrealistic to liquidate the earthquake in Armenia. Therefore, specifically the liquidation of the disaster in Chernobyl, the consequences, the subsequent actions, were only possible for our union, the cohesion of our union, the mobilization of all forces.

"Therefore, I would like, on behalf of the government, to express sympathy to all who suffered in this disaster, to bow my head to those who perished, and to wish for the most rapid fulfilment of the action plan, which will be adopted. In my view it will be adopted today. Of course, it is directed, well, primarily, first of all, it is directed toward ensuring everything is done for those people who have come to this hard, pitiful condition."

Subsequent to Ryzhkov's address, the program continues as before. The items include a visit to a Belorussian farm where deformed animals have been born. Scientists are continuing to study possible mutations in wildlife in the area. The International Atomic Energy Authority chairman speaks from Vienna. At the end of the program, charity spokesmen express thanks to donors. Cosmonaut Savitskaya is among the speakers. The program concludes with a general sing-a-long.

Military

Lizichev at Writers Meeting To Mark WWII Victory

PM3004145590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Major V. Kazakov report: "Writers Conference"]

[Text] An all-union creative writers conference devoted to the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War was held by the USSR Writers Union together with the Ministry of Defense in the Central House of the Soviet Army 25-26 April.

It was attended by Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, USSR Writers Union Secretaries Yu. Gribov, Yu. Verchenko, and I. Stadnyuk, and a large group of officers, generals, marshals, and war veterans. [passage omitted]

Radiation Safety of Murmansk Fleet Satisfactory

LD3004214290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2100 GMT 30 Apr 90

[Text] A temporary commission for matters of radiation safety on vessels, at bases, and at coastal sub-units of the Red Banner Northern Fleet has completed its work in Murmansk. It included officials of various military and civilian environmental protection departments, organizations, and institutions. They noted the high level of radiation monitoring in the fleet and the satisfactory state of vessels and installations in use.

As for rumors about the towing into the Kolskiy Zaliv of the submarine Komsomolets, which sank in the Norwegian Sea a little over a year ago, they are groundless. No decision has been taken on raising the submarine. Monitoring and research work is being carried out in the area where it sank.

Problems of Tu-160 Program Surveyed

PM0205080190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 May 90 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Yelena Agapova article: "The Tu-160: A Superaircraft Through the Eyes of Its Crew and a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Correspondent"]

[Text] SAC—Strategic Air Command—aircraft take off each day from USAF bases. They fly with cruise and guided missiles on board... The question is: Where do they fly?

As of 20 April this year, SAC had more than 422 nuclear-capable aircraft on its combat strength: 97 B-1 strategic bombers, 263 B-52 bombers, and 62 FB-111 aircraft. When these numbers are taken into account, the number of nuclear munition units per single strike reaches 4,717. What does this translate into? It translates into several thousand Hiroshimas. Up to 100 strategic bombers are on permanent five-minute takeoff alert at 25 USAF bases.

SAC conducts its "Global Shield" exercises annually. In compliance with the exercise plan, up to 200 nuclear-capable aircraft take off into the sky. This resembles a sword more than a shield. The objective of the exercise is to work out a strike delivery against the USSR.

We received this information at first hand—from Marshal of Aviation Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister and Air Force commander in chief. This information confirms yet again: We are living in the real world and we must have adequate forces to ensure national security. This is the purpose of the long-range aviation's existence.

Guys for the Seventh Heaven

I was not allowed to fly in the Tu-160 strategic bomber. It was categorically refused.

Where do you want to go, woman? The recently declassified Tu-160—or "Black Jack," as this superaircraft is known in the West—is way out of your class. An aircraft is a ship of the air. It is only too well known that there is no room for skirts on a ship. They only cause major trouble, or so it is claimed.

Now I know how superstitious the long-range aviation airmen are. They will not be photographed prior to takeoff. They will not fly in brand new uniforms. Nothing at all will make them fly an aircraft numbered "13." I found out, incidentally, that aircraft with this number simply do not exist in the long-range aviation. What is the point in even raising the question about women?

I would fly even in a "13." The point, however, is that this really is impossible. The real reason, thank God, is not the fact that I am a woman. The reason is perfectly valid: The Tu-160 does not have any spare seats with rescue equipment. The seats are allocated to the four crew members. And that is all. Not even the Air Force commander in chief would be allowed to fly without rescue equipment or ejection seat, never mind a journalist like me. Not much of a consolation, but consolation nonetheless.

There was no choice. There was only one other option—a Tu-160 on the ground. To take a look at the "innards"

of its huge white body, weighing 275 tonnes, is still a scoop. The body looks beautiful and perfect from the outside. True enough, there won't be much enthusiasm about shape and design if a light-gray cruise missile were to be released from the white "bird's" belly.

There it stands, this apocalyptic reality. Just two steps away. Makes you feel apprehensive. Your immediate thought is: Who is entrusted to take up into the sky these mighty missile launchers capable of incinerating half the world? Who are they, these people?

Ship Commander Valeriy Shcherbak. His number two Pavel Shchekin, navigators Vladimir Chernov and Aleksandr Vishnyakov. They all are guards majors, 1st class combat airmen and navigators. Their average age is 35 years. Ordinary people. No two of them the same. Vishnyakov builds computers and computer games. Not for himself, for the Officers' Club. Chernov writes screenplays, acts in amateur performances. I cannot say much about Pavel Shchekin—he is the silent one. The commander has his own favorite passtime—to sit back and read a bit, science fiction is his favorite. But what about the girls?

Look at their youthful faces in the photograph published on page two. A get-together at the commander's apartment. After the flight. With their wives. True enough, we did not manage to get all the children, some of them were at school.

I am grateful to the crew. Despite the superstition, the airmen welcomed me in their Tu-160 while technical personnel were preparing it for flight. To be more precise, I did not go through the hatch, the commander pulled me by the hand up a three-story high vertical ladder.

The cockpit of the Tu-160 is stupefying, to say the least. Only a dilettante would call it an aircraft. The military have a different name for it—long-range aviation airborne strike complex. Describing its electronic equipment is a hopeless task. More than 100 computers operate in flight. The pilot performs over 2,000 motions and switch operations within 15 minutes. The commander performs two operations per second during landing. This, in my view, is beyond the limits of the possible....

I was offered the right-hand seat—the one occupied by the commander's number two. I right away hit my head against some projection. The commander commented with a smile: "The Carlucci panel." It transpired that the former U.S. Secretary of Defense hit exactly the same electronic panel when he was invited to tour the cockpit following a demonstration flight in the Tu-160 near Moscow. All novices hit it.

The Tu-160 belongs to a totally different world. But our conversation is about earthly matters. About the aircraft's reliability. About its makers. The airmen have many questions to ask these people. "Negative aspects" of army life provide a special topic. The crew members'

opinions differ completely. This is only normal. We were taught to think uniformly for too long a time. They agree on one point: Professionalism in the Army must be boosted. You cannot fly too high without it.

"But, after all, you are airmen, professionals," I tried to pursue the matter.

The commander: I will become a professional only when I do nothing but my flying job. Meanwhile.... Tomorrow, for example, I'll be digging a trench beneath the kindergarten's heat supply pipeline. There's nobody else to do it....

Seconds Away from Disaster

Journalists first visited this long-range aviation airfield last summer. Many were dazzled by the new combat aircraft and its wingspan. I recall the jubilant tone adopted by some articles: white swan, the nation's weapon, conquerors of the Fifth Ocean, gods.... The only point is that the airmen recall this journalese with obvious annoyance. Now I understand why.

Half-truths are the worst form of lies. And the truth about the Tu-160, no matter how gracefully it takes off, must come back down to earth. Enthusiasm must be replaced by a sober appraisal of the situation. There were hundreds of in-flight failures on the Tu-160 last year. Due to design and production defects.

I anticipate critical rejoinders: Why speak openly about the shortcomings of military equipment? This would only serve the interests of those "on the other side." The logic is implacable. It was applied for years on end by the mighty Ministry of the Aviation Industry, which was in a zone beyond criticism. Not a single item containing even the slightest criticism of designers and their aircraft could have appeared in the press without the Ministry of the Aviation Industry's consent. But aircraft did crash....

I think that we would not have been writing so much about the bitter lessons of the loss of the submarine "Komsomolets" and surmounting the former barriers of secrecy, if the unreliability of rescue equipment had been openly reported. And in good time.

Emergencies on the Tu-160 are no exceptions to the rule. I assume that I would not be undermining either our combat readiness or our prestige as a major power if I were to report just one such situation. On the contrary, this incident reaffirms that our military airmen are top professionals who can fly everything that flies, and even things that at times cannot fly. An engine on each of two missile carriers failed to ignite while still on the ground at the time of the Tu-160's famous demonstration flight to which Carlucci was invited. Confusion? You bet. It was decided: Take off on three engines. They took off, and they flew as if nothing had happened. True enough, nobody was made a "Hero," as it might have happened in the past.

Defects, failures, and breakdowns are of course possible in such a complex machine. Especially since the Tu-160 is in experimental use. Many shortcomings have already been revealed and eliminated during this period. This is a fact. But I personally cannot rest at ease knowing that Valeriy Shcherbak's crew is flying a "raw" aircraft. That this crew, like others, was doomed to run this risk in advance. The reason is simple: The Tu-160 was released for experimental use with a mass of shortcomings.

I am a civilian. And I do not automatically benefit from the expertise of aviation specialists. But even I realize that the ejection seat is the only means to save an airman in an emergency. Defects in its design rank among the most dangerous. Aircraft are not allowed in use if such defects are present. This is natural. Something else is unnatural. The fact that people are still flying this latest long-range strategic bomber with this dangerous defect. There is one seat position from which an airman cannot eject from the aircraft in an emergency. This is a scandalous fact. But the design bureau is in no hurry to eliminate the defect.

Do not put the seat in this position—this is what the designers say. And that is all they have to say. Meanwhile, a "long-ranger" airman is physically incapable of remaining in one and the same position during his airborne marathon. In the same way that he is unable to fly without his safety helmet and oxygen mask. Items of equipment that are much more basic than ejection seats. And yet, they are in short supply. They are needed as much as the air that people breathe. Helmets in this regiment (and not only there!) are handed around from one person to another. What does this mean? Navigator Vladimir Chernov, who is short and thin, always finds other people's helmets too big. The helmet represents a weight of 1.5 kg to be worn on the head throughout the flight. Its oxygen mask is not connected. If the cabin is depressurized, Volodya Chernov will not survive. Nor will many others who are in the same situation.

Not so long ago, newspapers reported the crash of a Tu-22 over Tatarskiy Proliv. The crew ejected into the open sea, but nobody was rescued. The Fleet Aviation airmen did not have life jackets. Nor do the Tu-160 airmen have them. Not a single one.

Let us recall: A single military airman's training costs 1 million rubles. Training for this type of aircraft costs even more. Airmen are not advised to engage in wrestling or boxing.... The aces are protected from injury. So, the question is: Is it worth trying so hard on the ground when the pilot lacks the vitally necessary means of protection and rescue in the air?

Comrades from the Ministry of the Aviation Industry! We address you via the newspaper. This regiment's airmen urgently need 52 helmets, 56 oxygen masks, and 39 high-altitude pressure suits. Without this, all the talk about flight safety is nothing but empty words.

Mundane Matters

At this point, it would be appropriate to turn to matters that are more mundane than safety. Like the daily bread, for example. Pockets stuffed full with blocks of chocolate are nothing but a wonderful fairy tale about airmen.

The navigators took me around the Tu-160 galley. A nickel-plated built-in oven. And that is the entire galley. What do they heat up? Whatever comes to hand. What do they cook? Scrambled eggs, as a rule. There are several alternative in-flight menus. It all depends on flight duration. This is what I was shown at the rations and supply depot: two small cans of apple juice, 15 grams of chocolate, 100 grams of dry biscuits, a small can of meat spread, two cubes of sugar, and a single-use Georgian tea bag. And that is all. Can a healthy man, working under such nervous stress, survive on this diet? Flight in and flight out. Not according to my book.

The defense minister flew in to visit the regiment last summer. A lot changed after that meeting with airmen and technicians: The line of people waiting for housing was significantly reduced and—and this is equally important—the status rating of Tu-160 commanders was raised by one step. The minister also issued the following order: The in-flight rations ought to be reviewed. A few items were added. It appears that this was a sign of incredible boldness. The reason being that military airmen's in-flight rations are determined only by means of a USSR Council of Ministers resolution.

Back in Moscow I saw the latest samples of in-flight food, even including prepacked borscht in special foil containers. It can be heated in flight. But even if this food does reach the crews, it will not be before 1992. Today the additional items are available only for those flying the prestigious Tu-160.

The question is: In what way are the "long-rangers" who spend 20 and more hours in the sky inferior? (It was their in-flight rations that I saw at the rations and supply depot.)

Only the Ministry of Defense Central Food Directorate could provide an answer to this question. Officials there explained: "It would be inexpedient to raise this question with the government on an individual basis. People must wait a little...." Later on, people in different offices hinted that airmen were apparently overfed in any case. They explained the reasons why it is impossible to improve in-flight rations for all airmen at present. All along, however, I kept thinking about the calculations made by long-range aviation specialists. An amount of approximately R11,000 per year—that is all it would take to improve in-flight rations for all "long-ranger" airmen and eliminate the problem. This sum is simply ludicrous against the background of a single aircraft's cost.

Dozens of accounts and funds are being opened in our country today. Even the most incredible ones, right up to collections of funds to protect dogs and cats. Could there

be a good reason for helping military airmen? If the R11,000 cannot be found anywhere, I would suggest opening an account to benefit "long-ranger" military airmen. I would be the first to transfer my fee for this article to such a fund.

Men of Iron

But let us get back inside the missile carrier. Our gastronomical chat was interrupted by a deafening roar. The auxiliary power installation was switched on. The crew and I got down to the ground. We joined the technical personnel. I shut my ears with my hands. No use. Will my eardrums withstand the noise when the Tu-160 engines are switched on?

I was told that two technicians' eardrums had failed. The maximum noise level permissible for man is 85 decibels. People here have to put up with noise levels of up to 180 decibels. The engineering and technical personnel work in ragged caps and worn-out jackets. They have to climb all over the huge missile carrier. The contrasts are striking. Here is one: a pampered superairliner against the background of the technicians' shack. They built it themselves, the technicians say, using the "scrounge" method. The flight shift lasts 16 hours. You cannot stay out in the wind for very long.

These people in their threadbare overalls look nothing like military. And yet they are officers. Guards Captain Sergey Shutko is ship engineer. "The most important man on the Tu-160," Shcherbak explained to me, "our lives are in his hands." I looked at "the most important man's" hands. Black like a mine face worker's. It was he who told me: "The Air Force is like [Alice's] Wonderland." He also told me: "The aircraft carry bombs, they also carry timber and Air Force officers...." Black humor rooted in daily life. "Shutko" and "shutka" [Russian for "joke"] share the same root.

"The most important man" will never rise above captain's rank. This is the ceiling. Other technical personnel will not get higher than senior lieutenant. A wonderland indeed. There is not a single other country where an aircraft costing many millions will be entrusted to a junior officer, come what may.

Are there, therefore, no prospects for these people? There are, unfortunately. Of a different kind, however. Guards Colonel Valeriy Ivanovich Gorgol, commander of the regiment, told me about some of them. Partial loss of hearing, diseases of the central nervous system—all this awaits the Tu-160 technical personnel just around the corner. Military medical personnel have confirmed: Some 12-18 percent of technical personnel become hard of hearing—suffer loss of hearing, in other words—after five years.

Special protection is needed here. There is no protection. The main items are lacking—noise-protection helmets, antivibration boots and belts; even gauntlets are in short supply. The items that are available, I was told by the technicians, seem to have been made on the Moon. The

terrible vibration which shakes all your insides is by no means everything. There are also corrosive fluids, toxic fumes. I repeat: There is no protection.

Some such fluid came all over Shutko's face recently. According to instructions, it should have been immediately washed with boiling water and soap. But where is the boiling water? Water has to be brought over in buckets when the aircraft is to be washed. They then crawl on hands and knees all over the aircraft, rags in hand. Sergey washed the fluid off with kerosene which happened to be near at hand. He was taken ill. His face swelled due to an allergy.

Shutko had previously worked on "old-timer" Tu-16's. They are as far removed from the Tu-160 as the earth is from the sky. He transferred here and got an extra... R5. Another example of wonderland? The missile carrier engineer's family budget runs at R341. He has three children. His wife is at home with a newborn baby. Work it out for yourselves.

Men of iron.

My hand is already tired of writing about this hopeless dead end. About these anomalous phenomena in the lives of people who do a very dangerous and extremely responsible work. This is not a hackneyed phrase. Valeriy Shcherbak's crew can take more than 10 cruise missiles on board the aircraft. With what else can this infernal work be compared? I personally can find no comparison.

I spoke about this with Aviation Lieutenant General Petr Stepanovich Deynekin, commander of long-range aviation. He, an energetic man, has managed to do a lot to resolve numerous deadlocks. Everyone knows what it takes to break through departmental pyramids and indifference. It is virtually impossible to expect anything to be achieved at supersonic speed. The commander is trying.

The long-range aviation's role is obviously growing in the present political situation. Judge for yourselves. We are cutting back on aircraft and medium-range missiles, withdrawing forward-based aviation groupings from East Europe.... There is, however, some more food for thought—in addition to what has already been emphasized in this article—for those who hasten to proclaim: There is no longer any military confrontation. Here it is. About 100 B-1B bombers have entered service with the U.S. SAC in the last few years. Trials of the latest B-2 aircraft, using "stealth" technology, have been accelerated. The bulk of B-52 aircraft have been refitted as carriers of long-range cruise missiles....

Incidentally, this information is also meant for those whose promises in aircraft building outstrip their actual work. And this work concerns our country's defense capability.

How Are Aircraft Procured

And now the ultimate question. What does the general designer think about the situation around the Tu-160? What about his collective?

Aleksey Andreyevich Tupolev, general designer at the A.N. Tupolev ANTK [precise expansion unknown], arranged to meet your correspondent. Unexpectedly, our conversation turned out to be much broader. It was more of a "roundtable." V. Bliznyuk, chief designer of the Tu-160, Aviation Lt Gen P. Deynekin, and Colonels Yu. Vorotovov and A. Galkin also took part in it. Virtually all the interested sides. Those who ordered the aircraft, those who designed it, and those who are now operating it.

Let me digress slightly at this point. The years-long deafening silence created a tempting myth that everything in our country was the very best as regards aircraft building. We gave assurances: Nobody is breathing down our necks in this sphere. Alas, we are no longer the leaders. There was no competition among firms. The experimental design bureau enjoys a monopoly. An absolute monopoly, at that. The principle is: If you don't like our aircraft, you don't have to take it. It has to be taken. And even though the Tu-160's designers tried to convince people that they work in conditions of tough competition, this is hard to accept.

The development workers now, according to their own words, suffer from the eternal problem: not enough money. The Ministry of the Aviation Industry refused to help. According to the general designer, the Air Force should help. In Tupolev's words, a sum of R50 million is needed this year alone. The calculation seems simple enough to me: The military have nowhere to go to. This is because they, the military, have a different problem: The Tu-160 has yet to come up to specifications. Who is to blame? Where to go? Where can help be sought? Nowhere. Given the prevailing situation, the culprit is impossible to find. And until this procedure is scrapped, aircraft will crash and submarines will sink.

Under this system, and for decades on end, industry has been "milking" the military budget to meet the cost of endless improvements. That selfsame regiment has turned into a field branch of the Design Bureau and of manufacturing plants for the elimination of the Tu-160's design and production defects. The money is flowing.

As a matter of fact, I asked Tupolev about his opinion of how much a Tu-160 crew commander should earn. The general designer replied without hesitation: R600-700.

A newspaper lacks sufficient space to list the different ministries, departments, main administrations, and enterprises intertwined in the tight knot of the Tu-160's problems. A single lifetime would not be long enough to go through all the filters of this gigantic conglomerate. They are not subordinate to the general designer. A discordant orchestra without a conductor—this is more

or less the outcome. There are no levers to exert influence, apart from emotional ones. Work is financed in the old style. Unfortunately, it is beyond the powers of the client's representatives from the Air Force to exert any serious influence on the course of work at the firm. Colonels Galkin and Vorotovov have a really strange status at the firm. Their salaries are paid by the Air Force. As regards party records or waiting lists for apartments, cars, and other things, these officers are considered to be Tupolev employees. I do not have the slightest intention of casting aspersions on them but, given this dependence, I am certain that common sense is lacking.

But this is only part of the problem. The main misfortune lies elsewhere. There is no comprehensive approach toward the development [sozdaniye] of aviation equipment today. An approach whereby the aircraft and its equipment and weapons would be developed not by unrelated departments, as is happening now, but under the general designer's leadership. There is a procedure for the development of military aviation equipment, which has been given the force of law by the government. But this procedure is nearly always ignored. It is not just a matter of monopoly. Powerful incentives and the best possible economic relations have yet to be provided as regards the birth of new technology. Output quality can be achieved only on the basis of tough competition and normal commodity relations. These do not exist. Nobody in the world has thought of a different way yet.

This also applies to those scarce safety helmets, oxygen masks, and life jackets. The enterprise which can manufacture those helmets is not interested in producing them. They have switched their interests to space work, which is much more profitable. There is no way to exert pressure. Consequently, since 1983 and regardless of several special Council of Ministers resolutions, the Air Force has been unable to get the Ministry of the Aviation Industry or the Ministry of Light Industry to manufacture vitally necessary safety equipment. People continue to ruin their health without receiving an answer to the question: For what sins are they paying by being assigned to work in such inhuman conditions?

And what about that ejection seat? The Tupolev staff tried for a long time to give assurances that the danger was not all that deadly. Finally, Chief Designer Valentin Ivanovich Bliznyuk succumbed. He promises to correct the defect within six months. He gives assurances that qualitatively new aircraft will enter series production. One would like to believe him! Because the Tu-160 is not just a beautiful and prestigious aircraft. Nor is it some department's whim. The country's reliable defense underlies the purpose of its development. Is this not a convincing argument?

...Valeriy Shcherbak's crew will reach for the sky in its Tu-160 tomorrow. A full-range flight. Each crew member will have his own safety helmet, his own oxygen mask, his own life jacket. Normal in-flight rations... This, incidentally, is a fragment from a beautiful dream.

These guys' life today will run as usual....

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Asks France, FRG To Mediate

AU0205150790 Paris AFP in English 1421 GMT
2 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 2 (AFP)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis has asked France and West Germany to mediate between Moscow and his breakaway Baltic republic, a spokesman in his office said Wednesday. Mr. Landsbergis made the request in a letter to President Francois Mitterrand and Chancellor Helmut Kohl, after they last week jointly suggested in an open letter that Lithuania "suspend the effects" of the March 11 declaration of independence.

Mr. Landsbergis on Tuesday read a draft of his letter to parliament, saying that France and West Germany could use their "international authority" with regard to Moscow, according to Vilnius journalist Sergei Kuznetsov, reached by telephone.

The French and West German leaders, who did not call on Lithuania to revoke its independence declaration, said that a suspension of its effects could ease the way to discussions with the Soviet leadership.

Moscow last month imposed an economic blockade on Lithuania.

Cables Mitterrand, Kohl

LD0205222890 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] [Presenter Rima Jakutyte] I shall read the letter addressed to President Francois Mitterrand, since the essence of the answer to Chancellor Helmut Kohl is the same:

Mr. President:

The states [words indistinct] and in your joint letter with Chancellor Helmut Kohl, a desire has been expressed for talks to begin between Vilnius and Moscow, by means of which a decision acceptable to all sides could be arrived at. Lithuania also deeply desires this. In seeking a dialogue it affirms the possibility of negotiations on all questions, with the exception of the Lithuanian State's independence, restored on 11 March 1990.

In placing our trust in France and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as in the other Western democracies, that they will support Lithuania's democracy, we ask you to relay to the Soviet Government our agreement to consider the idea of temporarily suspending those consequences of the decisions adopted by Lithuania's sovereign parliament that are the most obtrusive to the Soviet leadership.

I also ask you, Mr. President to accept the assurance of my highest respect.

[Signed] Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis

Vilnius To Consider Suspension of Decisions

AU0205190390 Paris AFP in English 1819 GMT
2 May 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 2 (AFP)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis Wednesday asked French President Francois Mitterrand and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to mediate on behalf of the Baltic republic in its dispute with Moscow, according to the text of the letters. The letters, made public by the Lithuanian government press office, stated that Vilnius was ready "to consider a temporary suspension of the effects of the decisions" taken by its parliament, in order to bring about talks with Moscow on secession from the Soviet Union.

The letters were a response to a joint message sent last week by Mr. Mitterrand and Mr. Kohl to Mr. Landsbergis suggesting that measures adopted by Vilnius to reinforce its declaration of independence should be suspended for a time to allow for negotiations.

His acceptance followed word for word that of their suggestion, and asked Paris and Bonn to pass on his acceptance of their proposal to Moscow. "Trusting in France and West Germany, and in other Western democracies, and in their support for Lithuanian democracy, we ask you to transmit to the Soviet authorities our agreement to consider a temporary suspension of the effects of decisions taken by the sovereign parliament of Lithuania which could embarrass Soviet authorities."

The parliament has notably passed laws exempting Lithuanians from Soviet conscription, taking over Moscow-owned property and introducing identity cards.

But in Paris, Mr. Mitterrand's spokesman Hubert Vedrine said that Mr. Landsbergis' reply did not constitute an appeal for mediation. "The term mediation is incorrect," he said. Mr. Vedrine added that the two West European leaders had not suggested any mediation, but had only offered "advice". "Our idea was to act to preserve the dialogue mechanism," he said, noting that French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas had offered Paris as a venue for possible negotiations if both sides in the dispute wished.

Mr. Landsbergis also made it clear that "everything is negotiable, with the exception of the independence" declaration. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis' Remarks on West's Reactions

LD0305020390 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 2 May 90

[Remarks by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 2 May—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer Rima Jakutyte] Vytautas Landsbergis, in commenting on the Mitterrand-Kohl letter and its reply, noted during today's Supreme Council session that

Lithuania is prepared to accept the initiative of Europe's major states to participate in resolving Lithuania's problems. This was stated in the reply. He also pointed out that in speaking of temporary suspension of consequences, specification is necessary to define which legal terms are considered by USSR as affecting its or its citizens interests, and which could be discussed, adjusted, or suspended during the period needed to start negotiations. Understandably—if such a period of time would be determined.

In evaluating today's political situation in Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis noted that events of recent days indicate in international politics, that Lithuania is not an object of some type of exchanges and negotiations among other nations—which is something we have reason to fear—but rather it is a subject, and one actively participating in international politics.

[Begin Landsbergis recording] We see in the West not a diminishing but probably an increasing reality of the Lithuanian problem, which is increasingly perceived as a verification of political, moral, and other intentions. Who is really who, and who speaks out on behalf of whom. From this even [word indistinct] pragmatic politicians cannot get away.

[words indistinct] something new was expressed, Europe's attention, Europe's middle politics [word indistinct] attention to Lithuania. Thus, a certain outward central change or division.

At the same time we see that the United States has not withdrawn itself, and such [word indistinct] could have taken place, it has not withdrawn from an active policy with respect to Lithuania. This is evidenced by the scheduled meeting of Kazimiera Prunskiene with President Bush at the White House in Washington tomorrow. Among those participating will be chairman of the World Lithuanian Association, Doctor Vytautas Bieliauskas. In receiving Kazimiera Prunskiene, it is stressed she is simply a deputy of the Lithuanian Parliament, which is democratically elected and represents its nation. I think this indicates our Supreme Council has not done badly in finding in this and in one other similar instance, a compromise decision, and did not withdraw the deputies' mandate from our ministers.

In addition, World Lithuanian Association has opened an account—an account to assist Lithuania. In several days' time, it acquired about 10,000 [currency unspecified] from the various countries where Lithuanians live. This is a start. In addition to this we are aware of others, both accounts and support organizations [word indistinct] in France, Great Britain, and elsewhere.

Such support initiatives, no matter what their actual material impact may be in the face of our difficulties, we will see they have a truly great political impact of great significance. It is of great importance to us that they want to help us and Lithuania, by such interaction, will become real, and without doubt is very real [word indistinct] our borders. Are our borders ours? Are we a

land which wants to be and can be open to the world? Or is it again artificially being hemmed in by new iron curtains? [end recording]

Supreme Council Examines Court Posts

LD0305094790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] The Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania. There is no live relay from the plenary sitting today, but this does not mean that there will be no information about the work of the parliamentarians. It will be supplied in news bulletins. At present a morning plenary sitting is taking place. The deputies are examining the candidatures of the judges and assessors of the Supreme Court of the republic of Lithuania. They were submitted by the chairman of the Supreme Court, Mindaugas Losys. The discussion started because the deputies are seeing the list of the assessors for the first time, and the list of the judges has been published in VYRIAUSYBES ZINIOS [Government News].

The debate did not end before the interval. It will continue.

Vilnius Radio Carries 2 May Council Session

LD0205115990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 2 May begins live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session for the day.

At 0900 GMT Deputy Abisalas reads out the agenda for the day, as follows: 1) draft law on enterprises of the republic of Lithuania. The issue is to be presented by the permanent economics commission. G. Vagnoris will make a report. 2) Concerning the rights of individuals repressed for their resistance to the occupation regimes. "This is not the first time we have tried to solve this issue and I hope we will solve it today," says Abisalas. The issue will be presented by the commission of the legal system. Deputy Juknevičius will make a report. 3) The first reading of the draft law on state control. K. Lapinskas will make a report on the changes to the original draft.

At 0915 GMT a debate started about how long the Supreme Council sessions should be broadcast live.

At 0917 GMT the deputies decided that today's morning session will be broadcast, but there will be no live broadcast tomorrow.

At 0918 GMT the deputies were asked to honor with one minute of silence Stasys Zemaitis who burned himself in Moscow and whose funeral is taking place at present.

At 0919 GMT Landsbergis delivers a statement on the political situation.

At 0953 GMT Landsbergis ends his speech. Questions are put to him whether it is true that Prunskiene has agreed to the freezing of the 11 March act. Landsbergis

answers that Prunskiene could not have spoken about the act; her statement must have been distorted by journalists. According to him, Prunskiene thinks that any issues agreed with Moscow should carry international guarantees.

At 1002 GMT the deputies are promised copies of a letter to Mitterrand.

At 1003 GMT Deputy Stankevicius makes his report on the blockade and its consequences.

At 1016 GMT Deputy Serksnys makes a report on behalf of the commission for the restoration of the state.

At 1024 GMT the deputies decided to debate the political situation in Lithuania at the plenary meeting on Friday.

At 1029 GMT a message of greetings to the Latvian Supreme Soviet is read and adopted.

At 1031 GMT the live relay of the session is discontinued. Reports on the work of the session will be contained in news bulletins.

Antiblockade Measures Discussed

LD0205113490 *Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian*
1003 GMT 2 May 90

[Speech by Ceslovas Stankevicius, Lithuanian Supreme Council deputy chairman, at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The commission cooperates with the permanent commissions of the Supreme Council, especially with the economics and budget commissions. [passage omitted] Yesterday, some members of the commission met with the minister of power engineering and agreed that he will submit to tomorrow's afternoon meeting basic proposals for the possibility and strategy of having the Lithuanian oil industry purchase oil abroad, and unload it at the oil base at the port of Klaipeda. You already know that reconstruction work is taking place at that base so that by the middle of May it will be able to receive up to 10,000 tonnes of oil per day.

Yesterday we instructed the minister to examine in detail what needs to be done at the Mazeikiai oil refinery in order to have sufficient capacity to transfer oil products from railway tankers, to assess the capacity of the railways in directing trains loaded with oil to Mazeikiai, and to transport processed oil products from Mazeikiai to Klaipeda. Then we will know what quantities of oil we could refine in Mazeikiai. [passage omitted].

We have already received a list prepared by the government of the most important materials and raw materials which Lithuania is attempting to obtain and also a list of Lithuanian products which the republic offers for sale to its partners on the basis of direct economic cooperation. [passage omitted] I think that those deputies who will travel to the Soviet Union's republics to meet deputies

there could use this information, which we will not publish in the press, for understandable reasons. [passage omitted]

Independence Plan Proposed

LD0205133290 *Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian*
1016 GMT 2 May 90

[Report by Deputy Gediminas Serksnys on behalf of the State Restoration Commission, at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Summary] There are many enquiries by people about the implementation of strategic plans. Our commission has drawn up a plan for the consolidation of independence. We have divided this plan into four parts: First, in the sphere of foreign policy—this means the organization of our diplomatic and consular service. Second, the restoration and development of international relations. Then there is the protection of the country. Here there are four positions: the protection of borders, the establishment of internal protection units, the reorganization of the militia, and the status of the Soviet Army in Lithuania. Third, with regard to domestic policy the plan covers the implementation of the law of citizenship, the problem of service in the Soviet Army by Lithuania's citizens, the rules of emigration, social problems, the reorganization of the system of education and science, and the development of science and culture. The fourth part concerns the economy and finances. This is a preliminary plan and it should be developed. All commissions are asked to contribute to the implementation of this plan.

Greetings to Latvia Read

LD0205152990 *Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian*
1029 GMT 2 May 90

[Message of greetings to the Latvian Supreme Soviet, read by unidentified official at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] To the Latvian Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania greets you, democratically elected members of parliament, assembled at the first historical session. You are greeted by the independent Republic of Lithuania whose citizens' will expressed, on 11 March, we are striving [words indistinct] the economic blockade and political pressures.

From the numerous family of the Balts, we remain two sisters on the shores of the mother Baltic, the shores of the Daugava and Nemunas. We are hardened by historical [word indistinct] and crossroads, the aggression of foreign states and usurped (?will).

We [word indistinct] by the striving for freedom and democracy of the fraternal Latvian people of goodwill. We are grateful for the invaluable political support that strengthens Lithuania's path towards real independence. We welcome resolute steps and close ties of economic and political cooperation of the three Baltic states.

We hope that the work of your session will be fruitful and that you will adopt decisions in the name of free Latvia in the family of free European nations. Long live free and independent Latvia. Only standing together will we be victorious.

[Signed] The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania.

Law Restores Resistance Fighters' Rights

*LD0305113190 Vilnius International Service
in English 2200 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] Today, the Lithuanian Supreme Council passed a law on the restoration of the rights of the people who had been subjected to repressions for their resistance to occupationist regimes. In addition to restoring all their civil rights, the bill defines participation in the resistance movement as an expression of the will of the nation.

The legislation is not applicable to those persons who were involved in committing crimes defined as genocide, as well as to those who took part in torture and extermination of unarmed civilians for their refusal to collaborate with the occupationist regime(?s). Tomorrow, the Lithuanian Supreme Council will continue its work.

Chemical Plants Closed Due to Blockade

*LD0305095390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0900 GMT 3 May 90*

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The main shops of one of the largest production enterprises in Kedainiai are out of operation. These shops manufacture phosphate fertilizer, which is in great demand.

Already on 30 April news was received, unfortunately only by phone, according to K. Pilkauskas, director of the enterprise, that the blockade ring had been pierced. There was a promise to supply the Kedainiai plant with apatite and sulphur. First, 57 railroad cars with these raw materials were sent. This would make the plant operational for three-four days. Unfortunately these cars have not yet reached Kedainiai today. It is feared that somebody has closed this loophole again.

News from the biochemical plant is no better either. The shop manufacturing fodder yeast is out of operation. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Spokesman Views Shortages Impact

*LD0305100390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0900 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] [Announcer] At the Council of Ministers, government spokesman Ceslovas Jursenas is at the microphone:

[Jursenas] Esteemed listeners, I want to briefly tell you about what is happening now in the Council of Ministers. The day started, as usual, with a meeting of the

government anti-crisis commission headed by Algirdas Brazauskas. The situation looked like this at the meeting of the commission:

As usual the first reports at the meeting were made by the directors of the Lithuanian gas and oil reservoirs, Vistynis and Ilikevicius. Of course, the situation is being controlled, but, as the saying goes, we are approaching a starvation regime. Therefore, there was discussion about imposing further restrictions on gasoline versus maintaining current restrictions for the time being and awaiting developments. Some concrete decisions were adopted. For example, a representative of the Lithuanian voluntary fire-fighting society who took part in the meeting left very pleased. He proved that the cut in motor fuel for this branch was unnecessary. The commission, on the proposal of Brazauskas, decided that at least part of the requirements of this organization should be fulfilled.

Concern was expressed about the approaching bad day, 15 May. On or about that date, or maybe somewhat later, the first boiler houses may stop working. And what does that mean? It means that enterprises that are very important for Lithuanian residents and the national economy will not operate. Thus, what should be done, how can this date be postponed, what measures should be taken? All this was discussed, and various proposals were made.

Other problems were discussed, too. For instance, how to employ the unemployed, whose numbers are increasing, and how to support them by paying two-thirds wages in line with the well-known decision of the republican government. Perhaps some people could take holidays, and others unpaid holidays. Where there is no other way out, how should they be employed in public work organized by local governments?

[Announcer] After the proceedings described by Ceslovas Jursenas, the commission leaders received the trade union newspaper POZICIJA, printed on Lithuanian paper. The Lithuanian paper industry is able to produce sufficient paper for the press, so long as there is no shortage of cellulose and pulpwood.

Prospects for Oil Production in Lithuania Viewed

*LD0305131590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0900 GMT 3 May 90*

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] Not long ago a drillhole was completed near Kretinga by the expedition of the administration [as heard]. It became clear that there was oil at a depth of two kilometers. Now the prospecting party has moved to another location, to Girkalni. [passage omitted] And now I am talking to Ignas Vaiceliunas, senior geologist of the oil prospecting expedition:

Esteemed Vaiceliunas, you have been working for many years in oil prospecting, looking for oil in western Lithuania. And now, when all the taps have been turned

off for Lithuania, we would like to know if we could expect anything from these boreholes?

[Vaiceliunas] Yes, we can, to some extent. Of course the current demand for oil in the republic could not be solved by this means, especially in such a short period of time.

However, prospects are rather optimistic; these must be sustained, and prospecting should continue, and it must be determined how to make the best use of available oil resources.

[Correspondent] Many people say that there is industrial oil in western Lithuania and that this oil is of rather high quality. Is this true?

[Vaiceliunas] Several oilfields have been discovered which are of industrial significance, and these drillholes have been mothballed. These drillholes can be opened at any time. The republic has to decide where and how this oil will be used. Concerning the quality, this is largely determined by the fact that there is virtually no sulphur in it, therefore, about half of the light oil products can be processed from it: gasoline, diesel oil, and paraffin. A greater amount of these products can be produced as a result of in-depth refining of oil.

[Correspondent] I am looking again at the derrick: such derricks have been erected in western Lithuania since 1968. Eighty-nine drillholes were made every year, and in each of these oil was found. The resources of oil in these holes are limited; however, I think these resources will help Lithuania in its most critical times.

Report on Developments in Lithuanian Media

LD0205213890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 2 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As before, everyone is talking about Lithuania both here and abroad. Kazimiere Prunskiene, chairwoman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, is overseas. After her trip to Canada where she was invited by local Lithuanian organizations, Prunskiene will fly to the United States. It is expected that President Bush will spare half an hour for her tomorrow, for a reception in the White House, in order to find out details about the situation in Lithuania at first hand, as they say. And what is this situation like today? A reportage from our correspondents:

[Correspondent S. Dorenko] Many mutual grievances have accumulated during the last few years among the peoples living in Lithuania. The provocative new political figures have gone as far as to directly insult national sentiments in their speeches. One of the measures which has irritated the Russian-speaking population is the compulsory transition to Lithuanian for leaders of any rank and tuition only in the Lithuanian language in higher education institutes, from next year. The Lithuanian language has traditionally been taught little and

badly in Russian schools and students in the senior classes are today confronted with a fact: higher education in the republic will apparently be inaccessible to them. One cannot help but notice signs of the fact that the Lithuanian leadership has begun to understand the explosiveness of national opposition. [video shows general street scenes]

The chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet answers viewers' telephone calls live every week on rest days. The broadcast is conducted in the Russian language. [video shows Landsbergis and others in television studio]

And the Lithuanian population is publishing newspaper [video shows copies of EKHO LITVY, SOGLASIYA, and newspapers with titles in other languages], radio and television programs are broadcast. A radio broadcast in Yiddish has been started and a program in Belorussian is planned. A Polish television channel is also transmitted. [video shows studio apparatus and television transmitter]

The republic's Supreme Soviet is engaged in regulating contacts with the non-Lithuanian population. [video shows Supreme Soviet in Session]

[V. Chepaytis, chairman of the Commission for Civic Rights and National Issues of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, identified by caption] We want to create a democratic society and democracy cannot be only for one people. Democracy should exist for everyone; it is not divisible because if a person is aggrieved in Lithuania, a person of any nationality, this means that there is no democracy. [video shows Chepaytis speaking to the camera]

[Correspondent S. Doronin] Those who were quite recently the opposition are in power today and one of the very important concerns of the new leadership is to achieve mutual understanding with the non-Lithuanian population and the road, evidently, for moving toward meeting one another half-way. [video shows street scenes]

Moscow's Stance Toward Lithuania Viewed

LD0305143590 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] On Thursday President Bush is to confer in Washington with the Lithuanian Prime Minister Prunskiene, who intends to present her interpretation of the situation in the Baltic republic. Earlier the chairman of Lithuania's parliament, Landsbergis, said at a press conference in Vilnius that he did not expect the meeting to produce results. In the meantime White House spokesman Fitzwater has said that the United States called for discussions and a dialogue and that in his view there are signs of movement in that direction. Vitaliy Gurov elaborates:

Evidently any dialogue should be based on clear points of departure and a striving to come to a compromise, if

one genuinely wants a compromise and not pursues purely political and quite illusory goals [as heard]. The stand taken by Lithuania is clear: The latest reports from Vilnius indicate that the local leaders are ready to discuss any questions that serve to aggravate their relations with Moscow and even lead to confrontation. This might concern, say, the problem of service in the Soviet Army, citizenship, electoral rights and some economic issues, but not the initial point of differences, the declaration of Lithuania's independence adopted on 11 March.

Now, what is the attitude taken by Moscow? This attitude has been outlined more than once by the Soviet leaders, President Mikhail Gorbachev, Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and many others. Moscow is far from opposing the proclamation of independence; this is an inalienable right of every Soviet republic, a constitutional right. However, legal norms should be observed in relations, the norms of civilized relationship. To trample on the law, to follow the road of ultimatums, declarations and pronouncements is the path to a blind alley. The Soviet leaders have said, let's return to the state of affairs that existed before 10 March. The Soviet Union has a law on secession; let's resolve all problems, political, economic and purely human, in accordance with that document, but so far no realistic answers have come from Vilnius. A member of the Soviet Presidential Council Yevgeniy Primakov has said that Vytautas Landsbergis was invited to attend sessions held by the Federation Council but he ignored all these invitations.

Many people wonder what is to follow next; stronger economic sessions, more political pressure, the imposition of presidential rule in Lithuania? Well, it's hard to answer these questions, (?well) let us hope that the calls for resolving the Lithuanian problem politically will prevail.

Vilnius Radio Views Military Draft Issues

LD0305135890

[Editorial report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1300 GMT on 3 May broadcasts a two-minute telephone interview conducted by presenter Benas Rupeika with the secretary of the Sajudis Council in Rokiskis, Audrone Baltuskaite, who says that in this rayon 60 youths have to go to serve in the Soviet Army. According to her, many young people are hiding, but 20 of them have gone to Panevezys for medical examination in the military commissariat. No militia or any kind of force has been used to force these people to respond to the draft. However, their mothers have received threatening letters stating that their sons will be punished in accordance with USSR laws if they refuse to serve.

The radio then broadcasts a two-minute telephone interview conducted by Benas Rupeika with the chairman of the Laisve collective farm in Rokiskis rayon, Zigmantas Pumputis, who tells him that only one young person responded to the draft and went for medical examination. That youth was visited by a uniformed official from

the military commissariat who acted alone, unaccompanied by militiamen. According to Pumputis, there are more young people to be drafted; as far as he knows, the militia will not interfere in military affairs in the rayon.

Lithuanian Unemployment, Sugar Shortage Tallied

LD0305113790 Vilnius International Service
in English 2200 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] At present there are nearly 15,000 jobless people here in Lithuania, including the 2,000 who stopped working two days ago in the sugar industry. The (?pool) of Lithuanian sugar factories are using local sugar beet and supplies imported from Cuba. Two weeks ago these supplies were stopped. However, Lithuania has received an official confirmation of this from Moscow only today.

According to (Algimantas Ozolas), head of a department of the Lithuanian food industry association, Cuban raw supplies for sugar production will be successfully processed at Soviet factories and the Soviet sugar industry is not going to be damaged in the least—all the more so since Lithuania had always sent out only one-sixth of its sugar produce to other Soviet republics. Most of it was supplied to Estonia. Estonia has no sugar producing factories of its own. Some of the ready-made sugar was transported to the Russian cities of Leningrad and Kaliningrad. However, now all the deliveries have been stopped. The present stocks of sugar are going to suffice for the consumer needs of the residents of Lithuania.

Further Reportage on Lithuanian Drivers' Strike

PM2804193390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy report under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Correspondents on Events in the Country": "Does the Lithuanian 'Ship' Have Sailing Directions?"]

[Text] Vilnius—You have seen this on the television news: Early in the morning, the streets of Vilnius were blocked at key public transport traffic junctions with heavy trucks.

You have heard the reasons for this blockade: We have been given 50 liters of diesel fuel, that is not work. Let Landsbergis' government either reach an agreement with Moscow and get our lives back to normal, or resign. The drivers are conscious of unemployment—albeit even temporary unemployment—stealing up on them from behind, and want a secure future.

What you have not seen are the hundreds of people forced to make their way to their place of work or study, to the station, and so on on foot, sparing no angry words for the leadership and even pithier epithets for the "blockaders." After all, the city's trolleybuses and buses are the townspeople's main hope today. Personal transport and taxis are standing idle. Kilometer-long lines are forming at gas stations for the 30-liter monthly gasoline ration; the blocking of the streets rubbed salt in the

wounds of alarm, uncertainty, irritation, and confrontation which are deepening with each passing hour. Objectively speaking, the blockade was designed to support the president's decisions and to oppose the new Lithuanian parliament's separatist ambitions, stabilize the economy, and consolidate society. But in effect this action, which reiterated Sajudis' well-known stoppage of two years ago, has produced the opposite effect. Directed against ordinary people and citizens who have found themselves outside the political battles by force of circumstance, it has been seen by these citizens as a provocative step across the fragile ice of civil peace.

What you did not see were State Automobile Inspection personnel dragging these "mechanized barricades" away in some places with tractors, in others by opening up the cabs—the vehicles had been left without drivers. It is hard to imagine the irritation that this aroused in the Lithuanian population. Mass media throughout the world are, after all, talking about austerity [ekonomiya] and urging people to be organized and united, while here... The ninth day in Lithuania's life in conditions of restricted energy resources, which started off so badly, ended as it began. I do not think that it is even a question of the disastrously empty shelves or the grim prospect of many thousands of unemployed, of enterprises that have found themselves on the brink of closure or that have already closed down, or of the impending "period of rationing." Lithuania today reminds me of a romantic ship which has put to sea amid a host of underwater rocks and reefs, with no charts, no navigational instruments, and no experienced commanders on the captain's bridge. The only hope is that everyone can swim—and that we will not sink...

The cessation of deliveries of energy resources to Lithuania is described in the republic as nothing else but a blockade and is perceived as such. People here refuse to see the cessation of deliveries as a result of the long series of decisions and resolutions adopted by the new Lithuanian parliament, blatantly severing all ties with the union and provoking the country's leadership to take extreme measures. The Lithuanian crisis has not left the rails of civil peace in many respects owing to patience shown at central level, the new thinking itself, and new criteria used in making assessments and in the methods used in critical situations, which we often see as abstract formulas. It is easy to see what would have happened to fugitive Lithuania a year or two ago, had it decided to have a show of strength with the Union...

You have to live in Lithuania to understand and see the complexity of the situation in the republic. You have to see and hear every day and every hour the flood of information, which has long since smashed all "cold war" records for sowing hostility toward the USSR. While showing worthy respect for the Lithuanian people's desire to revive their statehood, it is necessary to distinguish the development of ambitions and the mania for greatness, which have nothing in common with national pride.

The reaction from the world public which, on the one hand, supports the Lithuanians' wish for freedom and, on the other hand, urges the republic's leadership to take constructive decisions, is generally seen as support and no more. The message from F. Mitterrand and H. Kohl to V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, and G. Bush's statement, which expressed quite definite opinions of the Lithuanian situation, have not as yet changed the Lithuanian leadership's political line. Although, when commenting on the message on Lithuanian Television's evening program, it was perhaps the first time that V. Landsbergis had spoken about the possibility of suspending individual decisions, with the exception of the act on the restoration of independence, stipulating that there should be a definite timeframe for the suspension. Today, as yesterday, the discussion is proceeding on the same note—we will not retreat, we will conquer. Words were uttered at a rally held by Lithuania's League of Freedom and "Young Lithuania" which prove that weeds as well as precious grasses may grow on this soil. "We cannot value freedom cheaper than gasoline." "In the past, Lithuanians defended their fortresses and would rather set fire to themselves than surrender to the enemy..."

Estonian Independence Letter to Gorbachev
90UN1694A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 13 Apr 90 p 1

[Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Appeal to the President of the USSR]

[Text] Esteemed President!

The decree of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of 30 March 1990 on the official status of Estonia proceeds from the legal instrument, still in effect, on recognition of the sovereignty of the Republic of Estonia—the Tartu Peace Treaty concluded on 2 February 1920 between Soviet Russia and the Republic of Estonia. This treaty confirms that no obligations in respect of Russia ensue for the people and land of Estonia from the former affiliation to the Russian state.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet proceeds also from the historical and legal evaluation made by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies of the Soviet-German Treaty concluded in 1939 and Stalin's foreign policy of that period and also from the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet decree of 12 November 1989 on the events which occurred in Estonia in 1940. The last document recognizes the declaration on Estonia's entry into the USSR adopted by the Republic of Estonia State Duma on 22 July 1940 as legally invalid inasmuch as it was not an expression of the free will of the people of Estonia. Proceeding from this, the USSR Constitution may not serve as the legal basis of the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Estonia.

On 2 February 1990 a meeting of deputies of all levels elected in the Estonian SSR adopted a decision to

embark on the restoration of Estonia's state independence and presented to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies a proposal on the commencement of the corresponding negotiations.

On 11 March a plenipotentiary representative meeting of citizens of the Republic of Estonia—the Congress of Estonia—demanded that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies conduct negotiations on the restoration of the Republic of Estonia de facto [published in Latin].

In the decree on the official status of Estonia adopted on 30 March 1990 the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet recorded the illegality of the state authority of the USSR on Estonian territory ensuing from the occupation of the Republic of Estonia. Proceeding from this, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet proclaimed restitution of the Republic of Estonia, that is, restoration of the base norm and the legal situation ensuing therefrom which existed up to 17 June 1940 and compensation for the damage caused. This decree of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet provides, on the basis of legislation of the USSR and the Estonian SSR, for the continuation of relations between Estonia and the USSR in the proclaimed transitional period.

Restoration of the lawful place of the former members of the League of Nations—the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Lithuania—among the independent states of Europe would make it possible to remove one of the last centers of tension in Europe and throughout the world and would appreciably enhance the prestige of you personally, esteemed president, and the prestige of the USSR and also the USSR's authority as a peace-loving state.

The peaceful restoration of the independence of the Estonian and other Baltic states, taking account of the legitimate interests of the peoples and states, would also mean an easing of the military confrontation in North Europe and the emergence of new opportunities for realization of the ideas of the common European home and East-West economic and cultural cooperation.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet is convinced that the creation in the Soviet Union of a democratic state based on the rule of law is possible only through the restoration of historical justice and compliance with all the generally recognized rules of international law. In our opinion, the question of Estonia's freedom is one of the freedom of the peoples of Russia and all other peoples of the Soviet Union. As the representative of the people of Estonia, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet maintains that the majority of inhabitants of the Estonian SSR is interested solely in equal and mutually profitable cooperation with all peoples of the Soviet Union.

In its activity the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet is guided unswervingly by the General Declaration on Human Rights adopted by the United Nations and also international pacts on economic, social, and cultural rights and civil and political rights.

Beneath these documents there is, as is known, the signature also of the representative of the USSR. The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet considers the internationally recognized rights of nations and the principles of social justice extraordinarily important.

Esteemed President, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet assures you that all its deputies will pay great attention to the assurance of the rights and interests of the entire population of Estonia and the general liberties of all its inhabitants. The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet will struggle by all the means at its disposal for civil peace and the safety and well-being of all inhabitants of Estonia.

Expressing the firm wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of the Estonian SSR and also the members of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the resolve to live in an independent Estonia, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet proposes to you the immediate commencement of negotiations between the USSR and a plenipotentiary delegation of the Estonian SSR on restoration of the independence and political sovereignty of the Republic of Estonia and restoration of the legitimate state power in Estonia.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet earnestly entreats that you express the official view of the Soviet Union on the issue we have raised and take steps pertaining to determination of the circumstances and the date of the start of the negotiations.

A. RYUYTEL, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Tallinn, 11 April 1990.

'Panic Buying of Gasoline' Reported in Estonia

LD0305085190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] According to the Northwest Information Agency, panic buying of gasoline is taking place in Estonia. One of the reasons for this is the debate in the republican parliament concerning the problem of Lithuania. Many motorists think that if the Estonian Supreme Soviet adopts decisions supporting Lithuania, a large part of the gasoline allocated for private cars will go to Lithuania. At the same time this would reduce the supply of oil products to Estonia.

Restrictions on Estonian Timber Exports

LD0305084690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] From 1 May the export of timber from Estonia is limited. This decision applies both to state orders and to direct exchange of goods. For the export of timber without license or in large quantities, an enterprise or individual will have to pay to the republic's budget a sum equal to three times the price of these goods. Apart from that, the export of parquet, secondary raw materials, and processed furs has been prohibited.

Riga Radio Carries 3 May Latvian Supreme Soviet

Landsbergis Visits

LD0305103990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0755 GMT on 3 May begins broadcasting a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. Announcers Busa and Tabuns begin by telling of the various pickets outside the building, and noting that Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Landsbergis is attending the session.

At 0759 GMT Central Election Commission Chairman Gunars Blums, who is chairing the session, greets deputies on behalf of the Central Committee (not further specified), expressing appreciation for the election, discussing Latvian Unity, and providing details of the number of electors. Of the 198 deputies elected, 189 are present. Blums then introduces the Lithuanian delegation, headed by Landsbergis, to prolonged applause.

At 0806 GMT Blums declares the session open. Television cameramen and photographers are given an opportunity to take pictures, while the announcers note that much attention is being given to Landsbergis and Dainis Ivars. The announcers go on to discuss the self-immolation in Moscow by the Lithuanian Stanislovas Zemaitis, and various details about individual delegates.

At 0814 GMT the cameramen and photographers are asked to leave.

At 0817 GMT Blums outlines the deputies' work to prepare for the session, and the voting equipment is tried out.

At 0823 GMT the commission of tellers is approved.

At 0826 GMT the deputies discuss the proposed Mandate Commission.

At 0830 GMT the composition of the Mandate Commission is approved, and a break is announced until the Mandate Commission's return. However, Deputy Imants Daudiss suggests that the break be employed in becoming acquainted with the voting equipment.

At 0835 GMT during the break, there is an interview with Landsbergis.

At 0846 GMT the break continues, with the announcers talking in general about the deputies elected, and saying the assertion that deputies supported by the People's Front were elected by a minority is absurd. They continue by discussing polarization, naming some deputies and noting those who supported them. The announcers go on to interview Sergejs Dimanis, one of the chief "federalists," who argues that there are not just a few Latvians in the CPSU faction. He refuses to discuss how they will vote on the independence declaration. Dimanis charges that the Lithuanians have become the beggars of the world. As an economist, he sees matters more deeply, but agrees that the situation between Lithuania and the

USSR is not proper. Dimanis disagrees with the blockade on Lithuania; he is not against independence, but the Constitution must be adhered to. In conclusion, Dimanis is referred to as the head of the CPSU faction.

At 0913 GMT announcers Busa and Tabuns resume their conversation.

At 0922 GMT the session resumes with Deputy Budovskis, chairman of the Mandate Commission, beginning his report.

Mandates Discussed

LD0305131990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0929 GMT on 3 May continues its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga, with the Mandate Commission's report continuing.

At 0941 GMT some questions are asked concerning the report.

At 0945 GMT the proposal is made to cancel the mandate of Deputy Rubiks because he may not be a deputy at two soviets—Rubiks is also a deputy of the Riga city soviet—as this would contravene the Latvian Constitution.

At 0953 GMT Deputy Dobelis proposes that the report be approved, except for the proposal concerning Rubiks, but Deputy Alekseyev argues against this.

At 0955 GMT Rubiks says that having been elected to the Latvian Supreme Soviet, he will relinquish his post in the Riga City Soviet.

At 1005 GMT a vote approves 197 deputies by a large majority.

At 1007 GMT approval of Deputy Smirnov's mandate is delayed until a report by the military procuracy can be heard.

At 1012 GMT the decision on the Mandate Commission's approval of the authority of deputies' mandates is approved as a whole.

At 1014 GMT the session is adjourned for lunch for one and one-half hours, and the relay is suspended.

At 1140 GMT the relay resumes.

At 1143 GMT the session opens with congratulations from a Red Cross representative.

At 1148 GMT the information branch cautions on the use of the voting/registration equipment.

At 1149 GMT 197 deputies are ascertained to be present.

At 1150 GMT the session proceeds to set up the Supreme Soviet Secretariat and to formulate its work. Meanwhile, the voting/registration equipment breaks down.

At 1155 GMT there is a short break in the relay owing to a switch-over to a telephone link-up.

At 1202 GMT the relay is restored and it is learned that Juris Dobelis has been elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet Secretariat.

At 1207 GMT a discussion is begun on the election of the Supreme Soviet chairman.

At 1220 GMT a count of the deputies present is held, there are 190, which with the absence of the Secretariat members taken into account, is the same as in the earlier session.

Latvian Parliament Opens Session on Independence

AU0305135690 Paris AFP in English 1327 GMT
3 May 90

[Paola Messana report]

[Text] Riga, Latvia, May 3 (AFP)—The new Latvian parliament went into session on Thursday to debate a resolution proclaiming the Baltic republic a sovereign state and asserting its independence from the Soviet Union after a transitional period.

Nationalist members of parliament, who claim to hold 140 of the 201 seats, submitted a draft resolution asserting that Latvia's loss of sovereignty due to its annexation by the Soviet Union in 1940 had no legal basis.

The opening ceremony was attended by Vytautas Landsbergis, president of the neighbouring republic of Lithuania, which was subjected to an economic blockade by the Soviet Union after it proclaimed its independence on March 11.

Journalists were not admitted to the parliament building here, but a text of the draft resolution acquired by AFP said that Latvia would assert its independence after "a transitional period."

Pro-independence members of parliament suggested at a news conference late Wednesday that the transition could last "between three and four years".

The draft said that Latvia would change its name to "the Republic of Latvia", but that the constitutional laws of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Latvia would remain in force for the time being.

A constitutional commission would be set to draft a new Constitution, but parliament would guarantee "all the civil rights of residents wishing to retain their Soviet citizenship", the draft said.

The Soviet Union cut off supplies of oil and natural gas to Lithuania after the parliament in Vilnius rejected an ultimatum from President Mikhail Gorbachev to repeal laws giving concrete form to its independence.

Between 2,000 and 3,000 demonstrators gathered outside the parliament in the old quarter of this Baltic port city as the session began.

Some waved the yellow, green and red Lithuanian flag and shouted "Freedom for Lithuania". Others shouted "Demilitarise Latvia."

Earlier Thursday, about 100 members of parliament laid wreaths on the graves of those who died in World War I fighting for the independence which Latvia won in November 1918. Dainis Ivans, leader of the Popular Front, urged them to "fight for the independence of our little country" of 2.6 million people.

The draft resolution said that the convening of the Supreme Council—the new name for the parliament—"constitutes the de-facto re-establishment of Latvian sovereignty which never ceased to exist de jure".

It described Latvia's annexation as "a crime".

Popular Front sources said that Popular Front deputies who held a drafting session on Wednesday rejected milder wording suggested by one of the Front's founders, Mairis Wulfson, referring to the Soviet Union's "failure to respect" its treaty of cooperation with Latvia, signed in 1920.

Mr. Wulfson is a close acquaintance of Mr. Gorbachev, who summoned leaders from Latvia and Estonia, the third Baltic republic, to Moscow last month and warned them not to follow Lithuania's example.

The outgoing president of the Latvian parliament, Anatolijs Gorbunov, told AFP on Thursday, however, that Latvia's aims were "much closer to the Lithuanian resolutions than to the decisions of the Estonian parliament", which have been challenged by nationalists there.

The Latvian resolution specifies that "popular sovereignty extends throughout the territory of Latvia," where only 55 per cent of the population are ethnic Latvians. Most of the others are Russians, many of them living in Latgal, a region bordering on the Russian Federation.

Mr. Gorbunov added that "the very delicate question" of Soviet military bases in Latvia "will be tackled only after the start of negotiations" with Moscow.

The members of parliament were first to examine procedural questions and to elect a new president—expected to be Mr. Gorbunov himself—before moving on to the resolution, probably on Friday.

Parliamentary sources said that Latvia would appeal to "the world's democratic governments" to "use their influence to encourage the Soviet Union to begin negotiations with Latvia" on independence.

A draft resolution before parliament also called on foreign countries to support the suggestion that the status of the three Baltic republics be debated by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The Soviet Union wants to see a conference of the 35 CSCE states—itsself, the whole of Europe except Albania, the United States and Canada—this year.

Latvia Resolution Predicted To Be 'Radical'

AU0205163690 Paris AFP in English 1549 GMT
2 May 90

[By Paola Messana]

[Excerpts] Moscow, May 2 (AFP)—The Latvian parliament, following the example of Lithuania and Estonia, is set to examine an independence resolution Thursday which nationalists hinted could be as radical as the proclamation which led the Kremlin to impose an economic blockade on Lithuania. Nationalists control well over half the seats in the body as a result of recent elections, parliamentary sources in the capital Riga said Wednesday. [passage omitted]

A spokesman for the Latvian Popular Front, interviewed by telephone from Riga, declined to rule out the possibility the resolution going to parliament could be as "radical" as Lithuania's proclamation of independence March 11. Nationalist leaders told Agence France-Presse they would give further details at a news conference later in the day.

Underscoring the move toward independence, some 260 delegates founded a parallel parliament a day earlier to try to restore constitutional bodies set up when Latvia was a sovereign nation between 1922 and 1940. The fledgling Congress of Latvian Citizens said it was ready to participate in "international negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Latvia". It also called for "the election of a legal parliament for the republic".

A similar congress was formed recently in neighbouring Estonia, which like Latvia was annexed by Stalin in 1940.

However the break-away congress is formed exclusively of Latvians who had Latvian nationality before annexation, and their descendants.

Early Wednesday, parliamentary sources revealed Popular Front members won 131 of the 201 seats in parliament in recent elections. Another 10 MPs [members of parliament] were "independents" with nationalist sympathies, the sources said, while two remaining seats remained undecided and would be subject to further elections in July. The remaining 60 deputies belonged to Interfront, a movement that wants Latvia to remain part of the Soviet Union.

Interfront Chairman Anatoliy Alexeyev told AFP, "Parliament is certain to pass the Popular Front's resolution,

probably after the May 9 celebrations (marking the end of World War II)". However, echoing views of Kremlin leaders, he added: "The only way to decide the future of the republic is through a referendum". And in that case, "The anti-secessionists would certainly carry it". [passage omitted]

Latvian Congress Issues Appeal to World

LD0305094190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1305 GMT 30 Apr 90

[Speech by Romans (Kusars) at Latvian Citizens Congress in Riga's Philharmonia Concert Hall—live relay]

[Text] Message of the Citizens Congress of the republic of Latvia to the peoples and governments of the world.

The Citizens Congress of the republic of Latvia is a parliament of the people which has been elected at alternative democratic elections through the initiative and free will of the citizens of the republic of Latvia, which was occupied and annexed by the USSR. That is, by those persons who were citizens of Latvia before the Soviet occupation and by their direct descendants.

This congress is thereby authorized to speak in the name of the indigenous inhabitants of Latvia, of its legal citizens. Those USSR citizens who have entered Latvia during the time of occupation, who wish to become citizens of the restored state of Latvia, are also democratically represented at the congress.

As a parliament of the people, the congress declares the Latvian people's inflexible will to live in their sovereign state, by legally restoring the independence of the republic of Latvia established in 1918—recognized internationally, but occupied by the Soviet Union since 1940—in accordance with its legal Constitution.

The congress expresses gratitude to the peoples and governments of those countries of the world that for 50 years have maintained in force the internationally legal status of the republic of Latvia, by not recognizing the legality of its occupation and annexation.

The congress applies to the USSR and other international organizations, with the demand of recognizing as early as possible that Latvia temporarily is an occupied country.

The congress proposes ensuring during the period of withdrawal the presence in Latvia of UN observers, and if necessary, of its security forces.

The congress expresses readiness to participate to this end in constructive international talks with the representatives of USSR and other interested sides, in order to arrive at an agreement:

First, on concrete dates on which the lawful parliament of the republic of Latvia, the Saeima, is to be elected, in accordance with the Constitution of 1922, and on which its lawful activity is to be resumed; the activity in Latvia

of the CPSU and other USSR political organizations and occupation establishments is to be stopped; the USSR Armed Forces are to be removed from Latvia.

Second, on the procedure according to which the losses that have been inflicted on the people, culture, economy, and nature of Latvia during the years of Soviet occupation are to be compensated; the industrial enterprises, harbors, railways, housing resources, and other economic and civil objects of Latvia under USSR administration are to be transferred under the authority of the lawful government of the state of Latvia; the repatriation of the citizens of the republic of Latvia and of the persons who have the rights to Latvian citizenship from the USSR and other countries is to be ensured; the emigration of those USSR citizens from Latvia who wish to leave the independent state of Latvia is to be ensured.

Third, on the rights and duties of those USSR citizens who wish to live in the republic of Latvia, preserving USSR citizenship.

The congress affirms loyalty to the generally recognized principles of human rights and norms of international law.

The congress will take into consideration the external security interests of the USSR and other countries, as well as the interests of USSR citizens living in the territory of Latvia which are not in contradiction with the sovereignty of the republic of Latvia.

The congress applies to the people and governments of the world, appealing for advance in the process of restoring the republic of Latvia's independence.

We are especially applying to the governments of the participants of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe appealing for an inclusion on the conference agenda of the question on restoring the independence of all the Baltic states.

We also request finding an opportunity for representatives of the Citizens Congress of the republic of Latvia to participate in the work of the conference.

At this time when people's dependence on the power of alien countries and all types of oppression have become an anachronism all over the world, we hope for active support by people and governments for restoring our country's independence.

Respected delegates and guests to the congress. As elsewhere in the world, in the Baltic region the sacred principle of self-determination must gain a victory.

We trust in you, the people of the world, in you, the governments of all countries. We await an early and positive reply to this appeal, both in words and in deeds.

TASS Reports on Latvian Parliament Issues

LD0305114490 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT
3 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga May 3 TASS—The first session of the newly elected parliament of Latvia opened in Riga today, with deputies debating whether to follow Lithuania's lead and declare immediate independence from the Soviet Union.

It is essential to take the road of dialogue with Moscow not to strain matters to the point of sanctions, believes Economic Minister Janis Abolins.

"It is argued that Latvia is the monopolist on the manufacture of some types of products," he said. "By giving up deliveries, it may also damage our big neighbor. But we are oblivious of the fact that Latvia and the Soviet Union are in different weight classes. The Soviet Union would painlessly do without our 1.5-2 per cent in the country's overall output."

"The Latvian Communist Party considers it unfounded now to break off state relations with the Soviet Union," republican party leader Alfred Rubiks, a member of parliament told TASS.

Ivar Godmanis, leader of the Latvian Popular Front (LPF), said the LPF group in parliament had already adopted as a basis a draft declaration of independence which is being brought up for discussion at the session.

The document is something in-between the Lithuanian and Estonian ways of doing things. A point about talks with Moscow has been included and a transitional period has been stipulated. It is planned to return to the four articles of the 1922 Constitution and recognize as valid those of the current laws that do not run counter to the old norms.

The LPF group which has a majority of seats—131 out of 201—has already begun to distribute portfolios in a future cabinet.

But final decisions will also depend on the opinions of others—the Equality Group, which unites about 60 deputies adhering to the positions of federalism, the neutrals as well as a number of representatives of the Alliance of Agriculturists.

Rubiks referred to the existence of factions as "the realistic embodiment of the pluralism of opinion that emerged together with democratization and reorganization of society."

"But I would not like political ambitions to gain the upper hand at the very first session of parliament, pushing into the background of our promises to the electorate," he said. "We all promised them a better life, civil accord and the possibility to work fruitfully in peace."

Some of the deputies at the session are resolved to tackle political matters at first and then take up economic ones. Others believe it inadmissible to put politics ahead of economics.

There are deputies who believe that a referendum law should be the first adopted document and that no one, including parliament, has a right to speak on behalf of the people.

Landsbergis To Attend Latvian Supreme Soviet

*LD0305074690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0700 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] The first session of the new Latvian Supreme Soviet opens in Riga today. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, and deputies Gudaitis and Ozelyte, have left for Riga.

Factions in Latvian People's Deputies Reported

*LD0205220190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2000 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] The first session of the Supreme Soviet of Latvia opens in Riga 3 May. It was announced today that the people's deputies of the republic have formed three factions. Deputies supported by the Latvian People's Front belong to the largest faction. At the session the People's Front deputies will put forward a declaration of independence.

A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held today at which the leaders of the factions expounded their positions.

Factions Outlined

*LD0305045190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0400 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] A session of the Latvian Supreme Soviet is opening in Riga. At a press conference on the eve, the setting-up of three factions in the Latvian Parliament was announced, and their leaders expounded their position.

Deputies supported by the republican People's Front belong to the most numerous faction. Its representatives consider that it is impossible to cope with the Baltic's economic problems without resolving the issues of the republic's independence. A draft declaration of independence will be put forward for discussion by the deputies. This declaration constitutes something between the Lithuanian and Estonian versions.

The second faction has received the name of equality of rights [ravnopraviye]. Deputies who see Latvia's future within a renewed federation have joined it. They also consider that the resolution of economic problems lies in the privatization of ownership and the creation of ownership by joint-stock, municipal, and labor collectives.

However, they do not consider decisions of such importance as a change in the form of a state republic to be a function of parliament. The people must express itself on this issue in a referendum.

The third faction has been formed by deputies put forward by the union of Latvian agriculturalists. In its activity the union is keeping to moderate views, based on realistic approaches.

Latvian Party Criticizes Separatist Forces

*LD0205180690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 2 May 90*

[Summary] [Announcer] "Tomorrow, 3 May, a session of the newly elected Latvian Supreme Soviet will begin in Riga. Our correspondent Ninel Meshkun contacted us by telephone today.

[Meshkun] "The election marathon ended in Latvia on 29 April, literally a few days before the session."

Constituency no. 44 in Riga will hold repeat elections within two months because neither of the two candidates polled more than 50 percent. On 29 April 30 candidates were running for 17 seats. Of the 16 elected people's deputies, 12 "clearly stated in their election programs that they could not countenance Latvia's future outside of the Soviet Union."

"Even before the first session, parliamentary parties have been set up—Latvian People's Front and Soyuz, the parliamentary party of the Latvian Communist Party and its supporters. The Latvian Communist Party, the Inter-Front, and the Joint Council of Labor Collectives, who held a big demonstration on 1 May, have confirmed their desire to seek ways toward the mutual agreement of all the peoples living in Latvia and to strive for genuine sovereign status [sverennost] for the republic, but not to sever links with the USSR. Such a resolution has also been adopted by a plenum of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, held in Riga. It says, in part:

"The development of the political struggle in the republic has brought the inhabitants of Latvia to a point beyond which a drastic change is expected in the lives of all persons, whatever nationality they belong to. We are all responsible for the future of the Latvian people and Latvia's statehood and for the decision whether or not to opt for the immediate severance of state links with the USSR. Utilizing the slogans and ideas of restructuring and the environment of democratization, destructive and separatist forces have in considerable measure prepared public opinion for forcing through of a fundamental change in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic's state-legal system. Its essence is an anticonstitutional breach of state links with the USSR, the proclamation of Soviet power to be illegal, the organization of elections to the Sejm on the basis of the Latvian Constitution of 1922, and the elimination of the Communist Party from the political arena. The Central Committee of the

Latvian Communist Party calls on Supreme Soviet deputies, communists, and their supporters once again to consider the measure of their responsibility to the whole people and future generations.

"That is the situation today. What will tomorrow bring?"

Increase in Militia Reported in Riga

LD0305094690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 3 May 90

[Correspondent G. Salciute report from Riga]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Crowds have gathered outside the Latvian Supreme Soviet building. Some carry slogans supporting Latvian independence; others, unfortunately, carry slogans opposing it.

This morning there are more militiamen than usual in Riga. Some have been brought in from as far as Sverdlovsk. We had a friendly chat with them; they cannot easily find their way about. I asked them why they came here and they gave me an answer full of significance: Today the session starts in Riga.

So, the session is taking place in Riga today, and the main events are expected after lunch.

29 Latvian Farmers' Union Candidates Elected

90UN1448A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p 1

[Report on interview of A. Bertulis, chairman of the Latvian Farmers' Union Political Commission, by LAT-INFORM correspondent N. Ivanova; date and place not specified: "We Are in Favor of Abandoning the Dictate"]

[Text] The Latvian Farmers' Union participated most vigorously in the pre-election struggle. Much work was done in the field of agitation and propaganda. What were the results of elections to the republic parliament for the Latvian Farmers' Union? A. Bertulis, chairman of the Latvian Farmers' Union Political Commission responds to this question.

[Bertulis] Of the 41 candidates nominated by us to the republic Supreme Soviet, 29 were elected. However, the elections are not yet over; the voters will be voting again for two candidates, K. Slakota from Balvskiy Rayon and M. Arnis from Yelgavskiy Rayon. Therefore, the elections are still under way.

We have created a quite capable group of deputies which include scientist-economists, Latvian Agricultural Academy instructors, manager-practitioners with agricultural and economic degrees—the people whose views may and should be heard.

[Ivanova] Do you believe that the group of Latvian Farmers' Union deputies is a separate parliamentary faction of sorts in the parliament of the republic?

[Bertulis] It is certainly not. As I see it, this is an agrarian center in the Supreme Soviet which is open to all deputies. Anybody may take part in discussions associated with developing draft laws on issues of common interest. Undoubtedly, the issues which the Latvian Farmers' Union deputies are going to discuss and work on are of interest to all.

As far as the political future of our group of deputies is concerned, it seems to me that it will largely depend on how the political structure of the state is going to be created. We have come to parliament in order to resolve economic issues. However, at present, when political life literally seethes around us, it is impossible to remain on the sidelines. We stand on the National Front of Latvia platform, **we are in favor of a sovereign Latvia, in favor of regular economic relations. However, we are against rash and hasty secession from the USSR; we are in favor of abandoning the strong center and omnipresent, intrusive dictates.** That is, in favor of the European way of a commonwealth of states.

Analysis of Split in Baltic Communist Parties

PM2704155490 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 16, 17-23 Apr 90 pp 6-7

["Unattributed article: "The Baltics' Communist Parties Split. Only To Emerge Weakened"]

[Text] The number of communist parties in the Baltics has doubled. What role do these parties play?

The Communist Party of Latvia [CPL] has also split. To be more precise advocates of an independent communist party (mostly Latvians, who constitute less than 40 per cent of its membership) have withdrawn from the CPL. This outcome of the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Latvia was not difficult to predict given the Lithuanian and Estonian precedents. In February a Communist Party conference which convened in Riga, declared illegal the decision of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks on the CPL's joining the AUCPB taken on October 8, 1940. The congress suggested that the relations with the CPSU be reduced to cooperation on the basis of partnership and equality and adopted new ideological principles, such as replacement of communist ideology with the concept of democratic socialism, recognition of the nations' right to self-determination and completely voluntary membership of republics in the USSR and the abolition of democratic centralism. Chosen as allies were the independent Communist Party of Lithuania and the Democratic Platform of the CPSU—the latter being an ally for promoting radical restructuring in the USSR.

The polarization of forces inside the Communist Party of Latvia became obvious at the January plenum of its Central Committee which declared that the understanding of the current process was impossible, if it was not linked with the events of 1959 when Arvid Pelse, appointed by Moscow as the party boss of Latvia, literally ransacked the CPL. Last year students knocked

down the memorial plaque installed on the wall of one of Riga's colleges in memory of Brezhnev's loyal associate, Politbureau member Arvid Pelse and then drowned the plaque in the Daugava. The monument to Pelse, erected according to the tradition when he was still alive—after Pelse was awarded the second Gold Star—is still in front of the CPL Central Committee building; this might be the reason why many people in Latvia still believe the party has not repented.

Those communists and party organizations who want a radically new, economically, politically and organizationally independent party supported the idea of secession from the CPSU. The opposing wing consists of those who recently levelled accusations of "separatism" and "nationalism" at the party leaders demanding that they resign and were in turn labelled "dogmatists." This wing unites traditionalists who want ties with Moscow to remain intact. The nucleus of the traditionalist faction is the Riga city party committee headed by Arnolds Klauzens and the Riga City Soviet, until recently headed by Alfreds Rubiks, the now leader of the CPL on the CPSU platform.

Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Latvia suggested a third way: to elaborate the new party's Rules and programme and to live according to them, allowing the CPSU to decide whether it likes to have such a party under its auspices.

The traditionalists who advocate preservation of the status quo have alienated themselves from the Latvians by questioning the idea of state sovereignty for Latvia. The independents cannot count on the support of non-Latvians (which is nearly half of the republic's population) who are alarmed by the prospects of waking up one day citizens of the Republic of Latvia. The Third Way tried to create a platform of concord but it was rejected. Unlike in Vilnius and in Tallinn, the congress hall was deserted by the other minority who wanted to set up an independent party.

The two communist parties of Latvia, just like their counterparts in Lithuania and Estonia, will now start wooing communists. Anyway, one can say with assurance that the sum total of members of both parties will be smaller than the strength of the old CPL. A number of party card holders will choose to join neither of the two. Will this change the political landscape of the republics? Not really. In the Baltics the communist parties have long lost their "organizing and guiding role." In the republican elections in Latvia, most voters were concerned not with a candidate's party membership but with his affiliation to the Popular Front, Internationalist Front, the Greens, the Social Democrats, the Agrarian Association, the Movement for National Independence of Latvia etc.... All of these political parties and groups had a clear political programme and the voters knew whom they were going to elect. What about the CPL? It had not one, but at least three programmes.... In the three Baltic republics the communist parties have, one by one, slipped into the opposition. The reasons are well

known: the possibility to openly express political views immediately revealed the absence of unanimity among Communists. The necessity to answer the main question—that on the state sovereignty—completed the division. As a result the Baltic republics have now six communist parties—three independent ones and three remaining on the CPSU platform. The independent parties, in my opinion, will continue their political evolution if only to demonstrate their renunciation of the past and the parallel communist party. They are very likely to change their names soon and become Socialist. The parties which have stayed loyal to their principles have good chances in the three republics, because of their leadership of the anti-secession movement.

The Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform which won only four seats in the republican parliament in this year's elections has become necessary for the Russian-speaking population and Moscow. If the independent Communist Party of Lithuania is today practically invisible in the current political struggle, its CPSU-affiliated counterpart is the focus of attention. The latter is waging a struggle against the Landsbergis Supreme Soviet and the Prunskiene government. The parallel Communist Parties in Latvia and Estonia are likely to play a similar role uniting opponents of secession. This new political mission will help them to preserve themselves in the political arena and will secure their social (or rather ethnic) support from among the Russian-speaking population. Some Lithuanians believe, however, that the CPL (CPSU) acts as the centre's "fifth column." This may result in a radical increase of anti-Communist sentiment among Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians. Independent Communist parties will be the first to fall victim to this sentiment and to be accused of disloyalty and lack of patriotism. The attempts to prove the opposite (by changing names and programmes, and refusal to cooperate with the CPSU) may lead to the complete disappearance of any weighty communist movement in the Baltics.

Latvian Doctors Express Support for Lithuania

*LD3004060990 Riga International Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 28 Apr 90*

[Text] The Society of Latvia's Doctors, in expressing support for the endeavours of the people of Lithuania for independence and taking into consideration the economic blockade started by the USSR against the republic of Lithuania, appealed this week to the Ministry of Health of Latvia to prepare the hospitals of Latvia, especially in the rayons bordering with Lithuania, so that these would be able to admit patients to whom, because of the lack of energy resources, it is not possible to give all the necessary assistance in Lithuania. The clinics of the Riga Medical Institute must be ready to admit especially seriously ill patients from Lithuania. The Society of Doctors has also applied to all the doctors of Latvia, appealing to them to responsive to the maximum and to give all possible support both to the patients and their colleagues of Lithuania.

RSFSR

Goals of 'Neo-Stalinist' Russian Party Criticized

90UNI701A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian No 17, 28 Apr 90 pp 1, 8

[Article by correspondent Vitaliy Potemkin: "Consolidation or Division?"]

[Text] Leningrad—It can only be regretted that the theses of the Leningrad Action Committee for Preparation of the Constituent Congress of a Russian Communist Party [RKP] within the CPSU or, otherwise, "The 'For Justice, Progress, and Concord!' Program for the Revival of the RKP" were not formerly published in the central party press. The action committee now has an excuse, as it were, to play the aggrieved party. We are being suppressed by the press, it is said, and the party apparatus is against us, but we, comrade communists, are only doing what we are obliged to do for the interests of the people of Russia and the Russian Communist Party.

LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA published these same theses, and the vast army of communists, discussing them in the party organizations, has realized what is going on. Many party conferences have already condemned both the documents of the RKP "in revival" and the so-called action congress. The protest of the communist rank and file with no desire for the founding of a neo-Stalinist-type RKP is growing.

The whole world has come to know how the action congress of the RKP, which assembled on the Lenin days of 21-22 April in the obkom [oblast party committee] Political Education Center in Dictatorship of the Proletariat Square, and which, though not in possession of papers on the election to the congress of the "author of the anti-perestroika manifesto," Nina Andreyeva, nonetheless decided (by two-thirds vote) to issue her credentials. True, it was ascertained shortly after that Andreyeva had simply fooled the congress and that she had no authorization, but no one officially condemned this fact. And to my question: "Why?" the organizers of a post-congress press conference were unable to give an answer which was in any way convincing. And dozens of participants in the congress who were present here demonstrated their anger at my unethical, as it seemed to them, question. They reacted just as emotionally, incidentally, to the question: Why were the representatives of many Soviet and foreign news media refused accreditation? And this even though Yu. Riverov, notorious for his public appearances with the "Pamyat" Association, was accredited. Or why was the report on problems of culture at the congress delivered by V. Gorbachev, deputy chief editor of the journal MOLODAYA GVARDIYA?

I was not accredited to the RKP Congress, although I would very much have liked to have heard the voices not only of Leningrad or Moscow activists but also the

speeches of the communists who came from the backwoods. Judging from tapes, there was no unity at the congress. Nor could there have been. I got the impression that no high-minded discussion of the fundamental document—the so-called "Program for the Revival of the RKP"—came about, and that it was commended to the congress for discussion in Russia's primary party organizations without appreciable additional work.

After the press conference, I was approached by several congress participants from the heartland, those who voted "against" and who see in the documents approved by the congress a threat of a split in the CPSU and the communists' abandonment of positions which were won with difficulty and which pertain to the democratization of our society. Indeed, how could it have happened that the RKP Action Congress resolved, without a referendum of Russia's communists and without batting an eyelid: "To recognize the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU as **actually existing** (emphasized in the congress resolution—V.P.) and requiring completion of the organizational structuring prior to the 28th CPSU Congress."

There you have it: The Action Congress, with no authority (only 32 delegates of the 615 participants were elected democratically), requires (of whom? The CPSU Central Committee or us communist rank and file?) no more nor less than organizational structuring prior to the 28th Congress. No one is proposing that we conduct even a discussion on the material of this congress and express our attitude toward it and its self-styled organizers. And, I repeat: no referendum.

And first off the question occurred to me: How do the documents of the RKP Action Congress and the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress agree ideologically? On the main fundamental standpoints they are opposite. The ideas of building a democratic state of all the people with the primacy of values common to all mankind are predominant in the CPSU Central Committee Platform. With the "actioneers," the primacy is of the class interests of the working class. The "actioneers" are campaigning for the creation of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, consequently? And the RKP will be a party of the working class? However, I, a member of the CPSU, am of a totally different party. Why are "all communists registered in party organizations operating on the territory of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] without exception, as the RKP Congress has already decided, members of a single party collective of the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU"?

And how can the RKP be in the CPSU if it is returning us to the past, in spite of the ever increasing movement of the communists toward genuine democratization? We need to lend an ear in earnest to the resolutions of Leningrad communists who believe that the RKP Action Congress has potential destructive power capable of splitting the CPSU and turning social and political processes back. There are known instances in Leningrad

of communists who have openly criticized the ideas of the RKP having been forced to quit their positions, like, for example, S.G. Petrov, second secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom [city committee], who is now leader of the oblast People's Control Committee.

A conference of Leningrad communists, which is being attended by the authors and propagandists of documents of the so-called RKP, which, seemingly, does not exist but which at the same time, seemingly, does, is being held at this time....

Never before had I experienced such a feeling of depression as at the post-congress press conference. What will happen to the leaders of the CPSU and the authors of the CPSU Central Committee Platform if they do not renounce their principles and strive for the primacy of values common to all mankind, I asked those conducting it. The answer: We will expel them from the RKP! Shouts of approbation and applause from some of the delegates. Why? It was popularly explained to us: Those advocating the primacy of values common to all mankind are renegades. And then followed the question: What, will M.S. Gorbachev be expelled also? There came the reply: He also and A.N. Yakovlev and E.A. Shevardnadze and all the others who are in concert with them.

The applause turned into an ovation.

Stroyev Visits Bashkir; Discusses Economy

PM0105081590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[TASS report under the general heading: "Meetings With Working People"]

[Text] Ufa, 27 Apr—Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic 23 through 27 April. He had meetings with collectives of working people from a number of enterprises and organizations in Ufimskiy and Karmaskalinskiy Rayons.

Much attention at these meetings was devoted to the party's situation at the present critical stage of its life and there was discussion of the main provisions of the draft CPSU Central Committee platform, the new party statutes and the CPSU Central Committee's open letter to the country's communists.

Answering questions, Ye.S. Stroyev dwelt on the central problems whose solution will make it possible to overcome the lag and to improve the situation in the consumer market. He paid particular attention to improving production relations and to the accelerated social transformation of the countryside.

Bashkir Oblast Party Conference Reported

PM0205145390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondents M. Merzabekov and V. Pinigin report: "Not to Repeat Past Mistakes"]

[Text] Ufa—What are the sources of the crisis situation in the Bashkir Oblast party organization? Answering this question in his report at the oblast party conference, I. Gorbunov, chairman of the interim obkom [oblast party committee] bureau which was elected 10 February, noted in particular that the whole problem lies in the half-hearted nature of decisions adopted by the obkom plenum in 1987, when there was a change in party leadership. Even then there was a real opportunity to renew leadership methods, but it was not used. Instead of becoming a political organ, the party obkom remained an organ of economic management. It is understandable that, in these conditions, many party organizations lost their role as political leaders and started retreating before the activeness of various unsponsored groups.

Igor Alekseyevich is right, the proper conclusions were not drawn at the time. But better late than never, as the saying goes. What lessons did the republic's communists learn from the past? What thoughts and ideas did they bring to their main meeting?

Let us say straight away: The previous complacency, and especially the euphoria, have disappeared without a trace. Tough assessments were made. The obkom's work in the period under review was deemed unsatisfactory.

But the tone of the discussion was not set by the obkom accountability report delivered by the interim bureau chairman; this report—which was traditional in many ways, constantly tried to embrace everything, and made statements rather than analyzed matters—could not have set the tone. It was set by pressing problems of reality.

The discussion itself centered on the question about the party. What should it be like, how should it develop henceforth?

"Forces hostile to socialist ideals, which indiscriminately slander the country's past, came to the surface during perestroika. Attacks on the party became fashionable," A. Fufayev, first secretary of Karmaskalinskiy CPSU Raykom [rayon committee] said in his speech. "There turned out to be many such people in the ranks of the CPSU. But the devices of factionalists, who are aiming for a split in the party, should not deceive communists."

The speakers at the conference expressed unequivocal support for the Central Committee policy to consolidate healthy forces in the party and dissociate it from those who have renounced socialist ideals. Delegates criticized the actions of party committees, which capitulated easily under pressure from rally democracy and renounced the struggle against those who pursue power by skillfully manipulating democratic slogans.

The misfortune of many party committees is in the fact that they continue to live in a world of their own ideas about life. But life is changing before our very eyes, it is changing in a radical way, whether you look at the economy, ideology, nationality relations, or cadre changes.

"We do not feel that the obkom's work is on the offensive," R. Yanbarisov, secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Bashkir Scientific Center Party Committee, said at the conference. "What we see is more like the behavior of gophers darting in and out of their burrows."

Indeed, because of the delay in solving the problems that had accumulated, the party organs inevitably found themselves on the sidelines of the fast pace of life. And some people are pushing them there on purpose, labeling all communists "apparatchiks."

Today it is obvious: Taking the lead means being able to forecast. It means talking about and doing things that other people only think about. Not sailing with the current, but steering one's ship skillfully. Not waiting to be nudged, but changing of one's own accord. An amorphous party organization, the delegates stressed, will always be beaten and will never be able to organize the masses. Now, when criticism of the CPSU has reached its apogee, when a mass offensive on the socialist concept has been launched, all those who try to denigrate the party, remove it from the political arena, and deprive people of socialist guidelines, must be resolutely repulsed.

"I no longer understand what kind of society we are now trying to build," G. Gilyazetdinov, diesel locomotive engineer from the Uchaly mining and enriching combine, said from the rostrum. "A society of fully satisfied people? But after all, we wanted to build a society of equals, where no one is rich and no one is poor. And that is not the same thing. And we managed to achieve a great deal in this direction. Do we have to destroy what we have achieved?"

It is hard to disagree with this worker's opinion.

The exacerbation of many political and social problems in the republic and the cadre shake-ups, which have become more frequent in recent months, were undoubtedly associated with the fact that party organs were not prepared to change over from their habitual authoritarian methods of work to democratic methods. Automatic cadre reassignments did not ensure the formation of a new-type party leadership, and they did not automatically bring qualitative changes. And V. Demus, secretary of Ufa's Kirov Production Association Party Committee, was right to note: "Today it is not just cadre changes that are necessary, but new concepts and approaches which would guarantee, on the one hand, the cleansing of the party from all that is casual and superficial and, on the other hand, true criteria for assessing the work of every leader. A reliable mechanism for the renewal of intraparty life is necessary."

Two serious cadre crises, which struck the Bashkir party organization within a period of three years, seem to have forced many people to reflect. And to support R. Musin, first secretary of Dyrtyulinskiy CPSU Gorkom, who said at the conference:

"Some of my colleagues believe that if an agricultural expert becomes first secretary, the food problem will be resolved more quickly. I believe that today we do not need an agricultural expert, or an oil expert, or an engineer, but an authoritative personality, a leader who is politically and morally prepared. A person who would be able to unite the Communists and restore the lost trust in party organs."

Many people were named as candidates for the post of leader of the party organization. But finally, the choice narrowed down to six persons. They included gorkom and raykom secretaries, a CPSU Central Committee instructor, and a chief of administration at the USSR State Committee for Public Education. A lively and sometimes sharp discussion of candidacies went on all day at the conference. I. Gorbunov was elected first secretary of the CPSU obkom in a secret ballot. There is no doubt about it, he has inherited a tough legacy. And only support from obkom members and all the republic's Communists will help him to lead the party organization out of the prolonged crisis.

The question of creating a Russian Communist Party was on the agenda alongside the obkom report and the election of leading organs. What was the attitude of Bashkir communists to this question? This was the unanimous opinion: New attitudes are needed today in determining the Russian Federation's status within the USSR. It must finally take up the position of an equal partner among autonomous union republics. This condition alone will create real opportunities for an economic, political, cultural, and spiritual revival of all the peoples who live on its territory, including the Bashkir people. And the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party and its Central Committee must guarantee the political defense of Russia's interests.

At the same time, the conference delegates noted that they are advocating a unified integral CPSU, and a unified party policy. They agreed with the proposal made by the CPSU Central Committee plenum to hold a Russian party conference 19 June in Moscow and, in order to speed up its preparation, delegates should not be elected separately but appropriate powers should be vested in delegates elected by RSFSR party organizations for the 28th CPSU Congress. The resolution which was adopted expresses confidence that the Russian Communist Party will become a mighty political force and will exert a positive influence on the republic's economic upsurge and on the recovery of the CPSU and the whole of society.

Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the work of the conference.

Report on Destruction of Krasnodar Kray Hurricane
PM0205153590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent A. Dergachev: "Hurricane in 'Armavir Corridor'"]

[Text] Krasnodar Kray—The hurricane born in the Caucasus foothills flew into the notorious "Armavir wind corridor" and went on a tour of Novokubanskiy Rayon. Its zone of destruction was narrow—under 70 meters. First on its path was the settlement of Rote-Fane, which it deprived of 12 roofs in an instant. Sweeping over the Rostov-Baku route, the hurricane overturned a loaded ZIL-130 truck (the driver escaped with slight injuries), destroyed a high-voltage power line, and broke ferroconcrete pillars. And, having torn off all the roofs in Kovalevskoye village together with the rafters, it "got stuck" in the backwater wood in the bed of the river Kuban: Mighty elms and an alder cut off at a height of four meters fell into the river. Losing considerable strength in the wood, the hurricane left for the Stavropol area.

"We have such 'guests' every year," says V. Pushkin, deputy chairman of the Novokubanskiy rayon soviet executive committee. "Our 'corridor' is directly linked to the Kalmyk steppes. And each time we count the losses. It is a good thing that this time there were no casualties."

Krasnodar Kray Soviet Chairman Interviewed
90UN1711A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 29 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with I. Polozkov, chairman of the Krasnodar Kray Soviet of People's Deputies and first secretary of the CPSU Krasnodar Kray Party Committee, by Yu. Nikolayev; date and place not specified: "With Anxiety for Russia"]

[Text] [Nikolayev] I admit, Ivan Kuzmich, that I came to Krasnodar for a very specific purpose: To ask about what "Polozkov's platform" really is, and in what way it contradicts "Gorbachev's platform." Or at least to clarify on what grounds playwright M. Shatrov, speaking to the ideological commission of the CPSU Central Committee, came to such a conclusion. I also prepared appropriate first questions... But now it is necessary, as the saying goes, to change things on the run and to modify the interview plan. But first of all I want to congratulate you wholeheartedly on your election to RSFSR people's deputy!

[Polozkov] Thank you.

[Nikolayev] And how do you feel now, that the results have just become known?

[Polozkov] Tired, perhaps, and also a certain kind of relief...

[Nikolayev] Yes, the victory is convincing. Seventy-one percent of the votes, when there were three challengers...

[Polozkov] At first, there were five of us in the district, and later two dropped out. Staying on to the end were Vasilii Andreyevich Kosenko, the young chairman of the "Hammer and Sickle" kolkhoz [collective farm], and Boris Yevteyevich Moskvich, chairman of the Kushchevskiy agroindustrial association. The campaign was intense, and the energetically competent chairman of the kolkhoz especially had a lot of supporters. I had at least 40 meetings with voters in a short time...

[Nikolayev] But was it worth making such an effort and, indeed, putting oneself in such a ticklish situation? I have in mind the problem of the third seat. What compelled you, a USSR People's Deputy, a deputy of the kray soviet, and its chairman, to also conduct a campaign to be a deputy in Russia? For it was quite clear that one of the seats would have to be given up all the same...

[Polozkov] To find the logic is not quite that simple. I will try to explain everything.

Well, let us at least begin with the fact that in this instance the initiative was not mine. Two districts were formed in the kray, where the initial elections were not conclusive. My candidacy was put forward almost immediately in several work collectives. Why? Did the people not know that, according to the law it is not possible to be a deputy of three soviets. As it turned out, they knew this very well, and, nonetheless...

When I asked the initiators of the nomination what motivated them to do this, the reasons I got in reply were absolutely unexpected. It turns out that they got the idea... from the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the subsequent energetic campaign in the press against the Krasnodar leadership and against me personally...

[Nikolayev] Excuse me, but what is the point of all of this?

[Polozkov] True, you cannot immediately see the connection. But in my (very likely, too emotional) speech at the congress, in the immediate nervous squabble that arose after it, and in the discussion about this that broke out in the press, the people instinctively did not sense that which, apparently, my infuriated opponents counted on and are counting on. For the residents of the Kuban it is not a question of who this Polozkov is: a conservative or a radical, an enemy of or a participant in perestroika—they looked me over from all sides a long time ago. This also is not the question: Is there or is there not "a parliamentary journalist lobby," when today Krasnodar residents run into its practical activity at virtually every step. And the people grasped and instinctively sensed a hidden danger behind all of this demagogic jabber and attempts to frighten the people with announcements that "if you lose to the likes of Polozkov—you lose democracy" (NOVOYE VREMYA journal No 13). They became convinced with their own

eyes that there are very substantial forces here in the country, including among the deputies, that with astonishing doggedness do not want to pay heed to how some people are persistently pushing Russia toward an abyss. They do not want to see how its history and culture are being run down, how it is literally being laid bare, and how this is mockingly being presented as new modern approaches, either as a search for non-typical ways of joining the world market, or almost as a paternal concern for the Russian person. Although, and this is absolutely obvious, the multiple-approach shady deals of the well-known ANT have nothing in common with concern for the welfare of Russians and the entire Soviet people. One can clearly see an attempt behind its operations for the rich to fill their pockets more quickly at the expense of the people's misfortune, and the poor were becoming even more impoverished and were going into the service of the latter-day nouveau riche.

[Nikolayev] Are you not putting it too strongly? You need pretty impressive reasons for such a statement.

[Polozkov] But try talking with the voters! Here in the kray we detained that ill-fated special tank train, and we stopped the mass shipment abroad of cargoes and raw materials that are necessary to the national economy, and which we ourselves buy with hard currency. And so what! Some officials came off with a little scare, and the "octopus" cooperative that removed the national wealth of Russia bit-by-bit continues to do so to this day.

[Nikolayev] But, you see, the state-cooperative concern ANT was abolished by a governmental decision.

[Polozkov] So what of it! The "production state-cooperative association ANT" is functioning, and in essence this is one and the same thing. Many of its branches are functioning. The "octopus" is dragging priceless treasures towards the borders as before.

[Nikolayev] Are there really new facts?

[Polozkov] But are there not enough examples? Is it not enough that the sticky tentacles of the "octopus"—it is well-known—have penetrated the country's diamond stocks, have gotten into the gold reserve, into arms, and into nuclear fuel, and I won't even mention ferrous and non-ferrous metals, timber, and products of the chemical industry.

You still need more information—please! Right after my return from the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, more than 10 tons of molybdenum in powder and tungsten, for a total sum of almost R4 million, arrived in Krasnodar. It is not just a matter of money! As specialists explained, these powders are used to remove dust from rocket nozzles. Extremely valuable strategic raw material! They were addressed to the very same Novorossiysk seaport. The owner of the strategic shipment is a branch of ANT, the so-called scientific production firm "Kamant." And again people do not see that they should take this fact seriously.

The voters said right out at rallies: We doubt that our Union parliament will protect Russia from pilfering and end the mafia activity of various "octopuses" that are entangling administrators, workers, and managers of state establishments in their net. They are now placing their hopes more on the new supreme and executive authority of the Russian Federation. To put it briefly, Russia is able to and should stand up for itself, and it itself must and can bring order to our great Russian home! And I was given instructions like these: Stop squandering Russian wealth, attain justice in distribution relations, do not permit Russia to be dragged into questionable economic experiments no matter what the pretext.

[Nikolayev] I read your pre-election program. It talks, in particular, about plans to inculcate new methods of economic management energetically and to democratize management, but what kinds of measures that do not inspire confidence do you have in mind?

[Polozkov] Please, I would not talk here even about some kind of specific measures, but about the need to be against stereotypes and artificially implanted forms of economic management, even if they are new. Be so kind as to tell me why we should engage in a search for a one and only panacea for all of our troubles? Examples? As many as you want.

Now you hear from everywhere: "Down with kolkhozes" [collective farms], and "down with sovkhozes" [state farms]. Only the free farmer, a property owner, they say, can feed the country. There is an intensified orientation toward a farmstead economy. Well, the Kuban peasant will take the land, and then what? The "Kirovets" tractor costs 50,000, the "Don-1500" costs 74,000, but seeding machines, cultivators, plows, harrows, and tillers are also needed. If he takes credit from the state and begins to work his farm, then even his grandchildren will not be able to settle accounts, because a quintal of wheat costs seven rubles 80 kopecks, a kilogram of tomatoes at an auction price—eight kopecks, and for each quintal of meat Kuban kolkhozes and sovkhozes have a loss of R34.

[Nikolayev] Incidentally, how did the peasants avail themselves of the new Law on Land?

[Polozkov] The law is one thing, and the peasant is another, and he lives the way he has lived. In the entire enormous kray, only 21 families were found who took land, right in the foothills in rayons where there are conditions for a farmstead economy. And take note, today not one of them has sown grain... They planted flowers and some fruit—what bread-winners!

In the Leningrad Electoral District, where I was on the ballot for Russian deputy, there was talk about one "farmer." He was allotted 50 hectares of land. He planted sunflowers on them the first year. He sold seeds all the way to Yugoslavia. Now spring is coming—he is planting the same crop again. It is not difficult to

imagine how this kind of "crop rotation" will end and that this so-called "farm owner" will ruin the land.

The entire risky enterprise of appeals for individual farming is especially exposed vividly in comparisons of conditions of economic management. In the United States, the power capacity of each worker on a farm constitutes a substantial quantity—almost 150 horsepower. He has computers, automated equipment, diagnostic equipment, technical services... But our Kuban peasant in the best case has 32-36 horsepower. And our horsepower—more often than not are parasites. The peasant works only 25-30 days a year with the "Don-150," of which there are 280.

But if our peasant was given that which the American has, we would then see who would work better. Kuban residents even now go to Canada, the United States, Austria, France, and England for agricultural work. Last year I met with mechanics from the "Communist Path" kolkhoz of the Crimean Rayon. They showed me a touching photograph. The owner of a large English firm is raising the flag of work excellence in honor of our boys. They worked better than everyone. They did not become de-peasantized, as we see, in the kolkhoz, and their hands did not wither away.

[Nikolayev] Well, Ivan Kuzmich, your opponents will read these lines and will say for sure: You cannot expect anything else from that "conservative" Polozkov. He also does not want to recognize the plurality of forms of land management...

[Polozkov] Excuse me, how does he not want to? On the contrary, I wholeheartedly welcome every outgrowth of new and effective economic management. I am for plurality and a variety of economic relations wholeheartedly. The whole question is about the basis on which to build an economic mechanism: on the basis of private property, or, all the same, on public property. Improvement in the production relations in the village is not the only factor in resolving the food problem. No less important is the technical equipping of our peasant, whether he is a kolkhoznik or a farmer. Particularly urgent is the need to set him up socially and to create suitable living conditions. How long can the Russian village vegetate!

I am convinced that our kolkhozes and sovkhoses have not exhausted themselves. We still do not have even an idea of their true capabilities. They are robbed through laughable purchase prices and incredibly expensive equipment, and their hands and feet are hobbled by subjective arbitrary planning... It is time to put an end to these troubles.

[Nikolayev] How many times have we written after Lenin: Do not dare to command the peasant! How many resolutions were adopted about granting independence to rural work collectives, but fundamental changes still did not take place. Perhaps a shift to market relations will remove all of these fetters about which you spoke...

[Polozkov] Providing we do not do something stupid again. No, I am for a market, but with one indispensable condition: That it be introduced gradually and the people be socially protected. In no case should chaos be permitted; otherwise, tens of millions of Soviet people will be exposed to a disastrous condition. Prices will jump, and then what will it be like for a teacher, a doctor, a cultural and educational worker, for all of those who work honorably in social production, and for our pensioners?

[Nikolayev] How can the forced transition to a market economy be explained?

[Polozkov] Obviously by the fact that it is no longer possible to manage in the existing situation. It is advantageous for all of us to quickly master the economic levers of economic management. And it is now time to put the government's program, which was adopted by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, on a practical course. But we must tell the Soviet people honestly that this necessary measure in the social plan will cost them so much and for a certain period. The people must know why it is necessary for them to tighten their belts temporarily. I think that it would be necessary first to work out a mechanism for social protection and, perhaps, to discuss it with the people.

But, in forcing economic reform, it is necessary to keep the ever increasing danger of the shadow economy in mind. Just read IZVESTIYA: "...profiteering or mediation in the language of our criminal law is a crime. But in the language of market relations, it is a typical commercial operation." So! See with what frenzy IZVESTIYA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and NOVOYE VREMYA defend the profiteering cooperatives. They stop at nothing, and they wittingly distort information and substitute concepts.

[Nikolayev] Excuse me, I will interrupt. I recalled the interview with V.I. Ryazhentsev, the general director of ANT, in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. He asserts that a correspondent of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA arrived in Novorossiysk to "keep watch over" the special tank train as soon as it came from Nizhniy Tagil. No more, no less. Although, as is known, that ill-fated train arrived in Novorossiysk on 22 December 1989, and I personally sent our Krasnodar correspondent to the Novorossiysk tank in the morning... on 13 January 1990. The paper printed his report "'Octopus' Under the Signal Post" on 14 January. The general director lies shamelessly, but the paper prints it...

[Polozkov] There is nothing surprising here. They judge for themselves. It was correspondents from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI who watched alongside a mill over another scandalous cooperative, the "Beysug," in order to prevent it from being closed. Although this decision was made by a session of the rayon soviet.

[Nikolayev] It seems that it was canceled under the pressure of newspaper statements...

[Polozkov] It must be said, for strange motives. Here is one of them. According to the law, the "opening, closing, and taxation of cooperatives are placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the ispolkoms [executive committee]," as was explained in IZVESTIYA by N.S. Trubin, acting RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] prosecuting general, and here, you see, a session of the rayon soviet dared to close it. I do not think it is necessary to explain what organ of authority should be higher.

I do not want to insist that our ispolkoms and sessions did not allow errors in the assessments of the activity of cooperatives. The matter is new, and it has to be looked into thoroughly, and it should be done in a straightforward way. However, it is strange that the newspapers are trying to justify forgeries, theft, and profiteering itself. The financial organs checked on more than 100 "dealers" in the "Beysug" sunflower seeds, but their names proved to be faked. Why were they not named? An IZVESTIYA correspondent tries to make it understandable: "People remember the dispossession of the kulaks, the breakup of the Cossack system, the resettlements, the persecutions, and the mass arrests." But perhaps everything is much simpler when it is verified, nonetheless, where the little seeds came from on which the crafty owners lined their pockets?

[Nikolayev] Ivan Kuzmich! I was in Anapa, Novorossiysk, and Krasnodar, and I particularly looked into the rows of cooperative stalls. And I must admit that you will not encounter such a variety of cooperative commodities in every region. But you, I have in mind the Krasnodar leadership, are earnestly depicted by some publications as an enemy of cooperatives.

[Polozkov] This means that it is advantageous to someone to distort the true situation. And it is like this. On 1 January 1990, 7,644 cooperatives were registered here. Last year, Kuban cooperative owners produced products and services in the sum of R745 million. Very many cooperatives enjoy great popularity in the kray. The roads here are always open to such as these. Well, but as for the profiteering cooperatives that have taken the criminal path, here, you will pardon me...

But why do such cooperatives frequently find defenders? In my opinion, only because some of our parliamentarians, scientists, and journalists do not comprehend the true scales of their activity which is corrupting society.

I will cite only one case. In the city of Kropotkin, the local cooperative involved the chairman of the rayon ispolkom [rayon executive committee], leaders of the department of internal affairs, the prosecutor's office, and the consumer cooperative in its machinations... Twenty-one persons were arrested, but the investigation is identifying more and more new names that took part in the illegal dealings. Now there are more than 150 all told.

This is just in one rayon...

But it is generally very difficult to conduct an investigation and to reach a decision on preventive measures. Intimidation and blackmail have become usual occurrences. We have somehow gotten used to them and try not to pay any attention to them. But there are situations when one is simply dumbfounded.

In the last few days, we see that a new wave is rolling in to whitewash the well-known ANT. Moreover, its zealous defenders are leading the readers and listeners away from the essence of the problem. They are in every way exaggerating the problematical story with the unfortunate tanks. Although it would seem that it became obvious a long time ago: It is necessary to look deeper and more extensively and to analyze what these "octopuses" have brought into our lives and what can be expected of them in the future. The published material alone is more than enough for such an analysis. But we do not by far know everything about that ANT. With each publication, new light is thrown on frightening facets of the state-cooperative association.

It was not long ago that the minister of the aviation industry asserted on the pages of IZVESTIYA what profitable partners ANT found, but the sensation that broke out around it, he said, interfered with the implementation of profitable deals and the establishment of relations with reliable business people. Incidentally, we now learn from this very same publication that this is not really so. The managers of the former concern tried to line their own pockets with hard currency, and not state pockets by any means. But then, if you have to trade in tanks and some other kind of equipment, then it is necessary to do this honestly and not to call cannons and machine guns cast iron "burzhuykas" [type of stove].

And, generally, is it not strange: The bourgeois businessman Osman Mansour, who fell into ANT's orbit, looks far more moral, proper, and honest than any of our industrial managers. Where will this lead to?

Another thing remains unclear. How, in any case, did ANT begin to conclude deals with questionable Western firms long before getting permission for foreign trade activity? What forces continue to foster it even now, when, it would seem, that the complete failure of the premature state-cooperative concern has been demonstrated? Why is the investigation going so slowly? Why are the investigators and employees of the inspection organs beginning suddenly to withdraw from the investigation, just as they are coming upon new and previously unknown ties of the former "state-cooperative" concern.

The astonishing "blindness" of high officials responsible for the security of the state is also causing bewilderment. Otherwise, how can one explain that just through one airport, Sheremetyevo-2, judging by a report in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, more than 21,000 consignments were sent abroad without customs inspection? What was in them? Who was the sender?

There are so many questions without answers.

[Nikolayev] Certainly, errors and shortcomings are also inevitable in a transition period to new economic relations.

[Polozkov] And so they must be quickly eliminated. I am convinced that humane socialism has to be built with clean hands, nonetheless, and that everything that contradicts our ethics, morals, and socialist approach must be cut off decisively. It is only in this way that we will be able to actually unite all of the healthy forces in society and inspire them to work aggressively. But this is absolutely necessary, if we seriously are attempting to create a rule-of-law federal state, to restore the sovereignty of the Russian Republic, to raise the living standard of Russians, to consolidate the Russian people, and to revive their culture and spirituality. It was alarm over the fate of Russia that induced me to give my concurrence to the voters, and later to campaign for the high seat of a people's deputy of the RSFSR.

Government Commission Reports on Ufa Contamination

LD3004053290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The report by the government commission on the elimination of the disaster in the city of Ufa:

The government commission, set up on the instructions of USSR President Gorbachev and in accordance with the directives of the USSR Council of Ministers, has examined the circumstances of the phenol contamination of drinking water in the water supply system of the southern part of Ufa and the measures taken to eliminate the consequences of the disaster.

As a thorough study of the situation showed, the causes of the phenol contamination were blatant violations of production discipline, the criminally negligent attitude of the staff of the Khimprom Association toward the transfer operations of this product, considerable overflows, and also failure to comply with the procedure for pumping out industrial storm runoffs containing phenol.

Employees of all municipal services, together with representatives of Minzhilkomkhoz [Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services] of the RSFSR and production collectives, carried out considerable work making it possible by 12 April to normalize the quality of drinking water and, from 18 April, to lift all restrictions on the use of water.

Between 29 March and 20 April, 356 adults and 54 children went to Ufa's medical establishments. As of 29 April, there were 15 people in the hospital, including seven children with a worsening in chronic illnesses of the gastro-intestinal tract. Cases of phenol poisoning have not been identified. Medical checks on all children have been begun.

In accordance with numerous appeals by the population, a group of specialists of the World Health Organization

has been invited for consultations. Their arrival is expected on 30 April. Files on those who are to blame for the disaster have been handed to the procuracy. For the purposes of the radical improvement of the ecological situation in Ufa, the government commission, together with the local authorities of Bashkiria—and taking into account the proposals of public organizations—has submitted a draft decision to the USSR Council of Ministers which outlines measures for reconstructing enterprises of the chemical and oil-refining industries situated in the city. The text of the report by the government commission will be published in full in the press.

Goals of New Orthodox Monarchist Party Outlined

90UN1563A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 16, 21-27 Apr 90 p 8

[Answer to reader's question by S. Yurkov-Engelhardt, chairman of the organizational committee of the Orthodox Constitutional Monarchist Party of Russia, prepared by S. Fomin and published under the rubric: "The Editorial Board Has Received 15,256 Questions Over the Last Week"]

[Text] I know from the reports of radio announcers that an Orthodox Constitutional Monarchist Party of Russia has been created. I would like to know about its goals and its program.

[Signed] G. Kuzminov, Sverdlovsk.

S. Yurkov-Engelhardt, chairman of the organizational committee of the Orthodox Constitutional Monarchist Party of Russia answers:

The Orthodox Constitutional Monarchist Party of Russia (PKMPR) announced its existence in Moscow on 1 November 1989. It took place at a church service in memory of "The New Russian Martyrs Slaughtered by the Atheists" at Donskoy monastery before high-reliefs spared from the destroyed temple of Christ the Savior. We expect to convene the first congress of the PKMPR on 19 May, the birthday of Emperor Nicholas II. Representatives of 60 cities and towns have expressed an interest in taking part in it.

In essence it will be a constituent congress, although the initiating group considers its party a successor of the Orthodox Monarchist Order-Union which was created in 1924 and which undertook long-term tasks the moment it was founded.

I must say that the creation of this party is something we are compelled to do so that we can achieve, through peaceful political means, a parliamentary majority which will then transfer all power to the Zemskiy Sobor [Assembly of the Land]. In its turn the Sobor will summon (not elect, because equals elect while subordinates choose) the legitimate sovereign from the House of the Romanovs. After that the party, having carried out its task, will be dissolved.

Monarchy is so universal that it has gotten along together with all political currents, including that of the Bolsheviks. And the PKMPR intends to join temporary or permanent blocs with any political parties and social organizations that share some of its goals. What are its goals?

According to the Manifesto, they are the transfer of all churches and church property to religious societies, unification of the components of Russian Orthodoxy, missionary activity, and the restoration of abolished classes; and land reform directed at allotting plots of arable land to the peasants as their personal property with the right to sell the agricultural products on the free market and to use hired labor.

A special point of the Manifesto is "to struggle to restore the violated dignity of the Russian military and the rights of the officer's honor and to strengthen the Army and the Navy, who protect from external enemies not only the socialist state but the integrity and the unity of the Orthodox fatherland."

The PKMPR envisions "within the new mechanism of a constitutional monarchist state, the organic growth of the existing structures of the Army, Navy, Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB, and the state apparatus with the introduction to these structures of a new nobility," with lands granted to it by the sovereign for faithful service and as compensation for the refusal of the representatives of these structures to participate in political activity.

Our goal is to achieve prosperity for all the peoples of Russia, independent of religion and nationality, through the defense of private property and free enterprise—the foundations of economic law and order in any civilized society. It is written in the Manifesto that only the Russian autocrat will be able "to conduct our nation to the long-awaited interethnic, social, political, and spiritual reconciliation."

Among the real accomplishments of the PKMPR, in addition to the aforementioned church service, are the publication beginning this May of the monthly journal PRAVOSLAVNOYE TSARSTVO ["Orthodox Kingdom"] and the formation of a society of the temple of the Tsar-Martyr Nicholas and all the Russian New Martyrs and Penitents.

A youth committee under the PKMPR was formed on 27 March which unites around itself monarchist youth of the Orthodox belief. The members of the committee (and at present these are for the most part students of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute and Moscow State University) consider it their first task to return the temple of Saint Tatiana the Martyr, converted into a student theater, to the religious students.

And finally, at the initiative of the organizational committee of the PKMPR, the National Society of Adherents to the Memory of the Great Sovereign was established on April 2. In addition to its goals of enlightening on a

broad scale, one of its first actions will be to erect the temple of All Saints on the Blood at the location of the Ipatyevskiy house in Sverdlovsk.

Comparison: Gorbachev Nizhni Tagil Speech

PM0105090990

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 29 April 1990 carries in its Second Edition on pages 1-2 a TASS report on M.S. Gorbachev's 27 April Nizhni Tagil speech. Comparison of the PRAVDA Second Edition item, under the general heading "Urals People Can Be Relied Upon," with the translation of the Moscow PRAVDA First Edition version published in the 30 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 105, reveals the following variations:

Page 106, column two, first full paragraph, last sentence, Second Edition reads: We shall return to them and then begin a dialogue.

Page 107, column one, second paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...is not some insight—from God, maybe—no. This is....

Page 107, column one, third paragraph, sentence three, Second Edition reads: ...thrust of this policy, so far no one has proposed anything else, anything serious or sound. There has been a lot of talk, but so far no one has proposed anything of substance. This must be said.

Page 107, column one, sixth paragraph Second Edition begins: We resolved the...; (omitting first sentence)

Page 107, column one, sixth paragraph, sentence five, Second Edition reads: ...scientists using our resources, our technologies. This is a....

Page 107, column one, last sentence, Second Edition reads: This change has, figuratively speaking, two tracks along...

Page 107, column two, second paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...today? Well, we "swaddled" it to such an....

Page 107, column two, third paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...where we can really get down to....

Page 107, column two, third paragraph, last sentence, Second Edition reads: ...is one side. The other side...; omitting "of the coin".

Page 107, column two, sixth paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...that does not, of course, remove the point....

Page 108, column one, third paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...recall of course everything that we have had to resolve in our nation's history. And since we are meeting on the eve....

Page 108, column one, third paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...mankind—we must recall and mention the feat...(adding "recall and")

Page 108, column one, third paragraph, sentence three, Second Edition reads: ...homage to them because, thanks to them, we now have an opportunity to live, work, and think. Many thanks to you for that! (Applause). This shows that...(adding "thanks to them," retranslating, adding applause annotation).

Page 108, column one, sixth paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...the great victory: Major state events are planned in Moscow. (retranslating)

Page 108, column one, sixth paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...state, the Army does, of course, need renewal and is already in the process of being renewed. Our new military... (retranslating)

Page 108, column one, sixth paragraph, Second Edition reads: ...contribution of our glorious Army and people, it must be said that the Army is our creation, it was and remains our pride. No one can be allowed to besmirch our Army. (Applause). But this body... (retranslating, adding applause annotation)

Page 108, column two, seventh paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...our perestroika and the improvement in and the changed conditions... (adding passage)

Page 108, column two, eighth paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...war" heated up and this worried... (omitting "in recent years")

Page 108, column two, sentence five, Second Edition reads: ...third day of traveling and meeting with the people and no one has asked whether there will be war or mentioned that. (Animation in the hall). People believe that things are changing for the better. This is good. So we have... (adding passages, editorial remark)

Page 109, column one, fourth full paragraph, last sentence, Second Edition reads: ...Just as we—I make no secret—are watching what... (retranslating)

Page 109, column two, third full paragraph, sentence twelve, Second Edition reads: ...can probably find the paper, but what next? This means that the most important lever of the reform is being undermined—the person's interest in labor. Why work for... (retranslating, adding passage)

Page 110, column one, first full paragraph, sentence three, Second Edition reads: ...government resolution which also addresses many of... (adding "also")

Page 110, column one, first full paragraph, penultimate sentence, Second Edition reads: so that people themselves can monitor its implementation. We, back there, in Moscow, will monitor it, and you here, on the spot.

We, without waiting for general solutions, have singled out Nizhniy Tagil, or rather, it has singled itself out through the situation which prevails here. We will help... (adding passages, retranslating)

Page 110, column one, third full paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: It is a shame for the inhabitants... (retranslating)

Page 110, column one, third full paragraph, sentence five, Second Edition reads: ...go to Belgorod—its industrial potential is far weaker than yours, but can it be compared with Sverdlovsk Oblast in terms of assistance for the countryside? So you do... (retranslating)

Page 110, column two, first paragraph, antepenultimate sentence, Second Edition reads: the countryside. What has it all boiled down to? The Urals supply the country with everything, let the country supply the Urals with everything, they say. There is reason in this, but it is too simple... (retranslating, picking up second full paragraph, sentence one)

Page 110, column two, first full paragraph, sentence nine, Second Edition reads: ...enough agricultural produce. I tell you bluntly: Put some effort into your countryside, comrades. We, for our part, taking account of the objective specific features of your region, will provide substantial support from state... (omitting passage, retranslating, adding "substantial")

Page 110, column two, second full paragraph, sentence three, Second Edition reads: ...the production of goods—above all, consumer durables—which are needed... (adding "goods")

Page 111, column one, first paragraph, single sentence, Second Edition reads: ..."Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, when will a... (omitting passage)

Page 111, column one, fourth paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...your information is, nonetheless, somewhat one-sided. People in the republics are... (adding "nonetheless," omitting "all")

Page 111, column one, fifth paragraph, single sentence, Second Edition reads: ...Presidential Council sitting.

The USSR president informed the assembled people that, following questions... (retranslating)

Page 111, column one, eighth paragraph, sentence one, Second Edition reads: ...in practical terms at the congress. The essence of... (adding "at the congress")

Page 111, column two, first paragraph, last sentence, Second Edition reads: ...between two peoples.

The president spoke highly of the businesslike qualities and the diligence of Soviet Germans.

M.S. Gorbachev read out... (adding paragraph)

Page 111, column two, third full paragraph, sentence two, Second Edition reads: ...that they raised, in particular, the question of increasing deliveries... ("in particular," retranslating)

Page 112, column one, first paragraph, last sentence, Second Edition reads: ...a considered fashion.

Many other questions from the inhabitants of Nizhniy Tagil were answered.

The working part of the meeting was over, but the people of Nizhniy Tagil would not let Mikhail Sergeyevich go: This is always the way when a great cause and a commonality of views bring you in just a few hours close to someone you have never met before. It was this human effect that the meeting chairman felt when he asked the auditorium for a minute of silence.

On behalf of his fellow countrymen S.F. Barkov, first secretary of the gorkom [city party committee], cordially thanked M.S. Gorbachev for the meeting and for his sincere interest in everything by which the inhabitants of the Urals live and in everything that concerns, pleases, and grieves them. Addressing the USSR president, he said that the people of Nizhniy Tagil are counting on help from the Soviet head of state in resolving the many acute problems discussed at the meeting. Although, he continued, we well understand that a very great deal here depends on ourselves.

In conclusion the gorkom secretary recalled that when the great Russian scientist D.I. Mendeleyev visited Nizhniy Tagil, he said that his faith in Russia's future, which had always lived within him, had been increased and strengthened by his close familiarization with the Urals.

"What a coincidence!" M.S. Gorbachev remarked with a smile.

To this rejoinder of his the audience responded with applause which said better than any words: This "coincidence" is mutual. (omitting passages, adding final passage)

Western Republics

Decree Issued to Aid Chernobyl Victims

90UN1459A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Well-Deserved Privileges"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council approved a decree on measures to improve medical care and social security for individuals who participated in the efforts to eliminate the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant (AES).

The USSR Ministry of Health, USSR Ministry of Defense, USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs],

USSR KGB, and the ministries, departments, and councils of ministers in the union republics have been charged with organizing supplementary medical examinations in 1990 for all individuals, who participated in eliminating the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES within a 30-kilometer radius of this plant (the exclusion zone), and regular clinical observation of the status of their health and medical treatment, as well as to create, on the basis of the all-Union assessment register, a single list of individuals, who were exposed to radiation (a State register), and to organize regional and departmental centers for their rehabilitation in 1990-1992. A method of establishing a causal relationship between the aforementioned individuals' illnesses and disabilities and the accident and performance of work to eliminate its aftereffects has been determined.

A number of privileges and benefits are being granted to the participants in eliminating the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

In particular, individuals, who have contracted radiation sickness and also those who have become disabled as a result of the accident, receive the right to free acquisition of medicines, vouchers for treatment at sanatoriums and health resorts, and free round-trip transportation (excluding taxi) from their place of residence to the place of medical examination and treatment. Employed, disabled persons will be paid temporary disability allowances, at the rate of 100 percent of their wages, up to four months in succession or up to five months a year regardless of their seniority. The resolution also provides them with a 50 percent reduction in rent and public utilities fees; the right to use the outpatients' clinics, at which they were registered during their period of employment, upon their retirement; the right to priority service at preventive medicine facilities and pharmacies, to use leave at an opportune time (as well as to receive up to two weeks of additional leave without pay), to priority assignment of dwelling space for those needing an improvement in housing conditions, to the receipt of interest-free loans for individual housing construction and the construction of garden cottages; and preference in joining housing construction and garage cooperatives and gardening associations, in service at facilities, enterprises, and organizations dealing in consumer services, commerce, and housing and communal services, in the installation of a telephone, and in being kept on the job during a reduction in the numbers or staff of workers.

Individuals, who participated in the elimination of the accident's aftereffects during 1986-1987, enjoy the same privileges and benefits, with the exception of free acquisition of medicines (they are given a 50-percent reduction), vouchers for treatment at sanatoriums and health resorts, free transportation, and reductions in the prescribed rent and public utilities fees.

Those who participated in eliminating the accident's aftereffects in 1988 are given the right to priority receipt of vouchers for treatment and relaxation at sanatoriums

and health resorts, to join garage construction cooperatives and garden associations, to priority service at preventive medicine facilities and pharmacies, and to use the outpatients' clinics, at which they were registered during their period of employment, upon their retirement.

It was recommended that the Councils of Ministers of the union and autonomous republics, the ministries and departments, the ispolkoms [executive committee] of the local soviets of people's deputies, and the trade union agencies implement, within the limits of their powers, additional measures to improve the material conditions of life and the medical and commercial service for individuals, who participated in eliminating the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

The decree provides for the institution of a breastplate for participants in eliminating the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES and of a special certificate confirming the right to privileges.

The privileges prescribed by the decree will be put into effect on 1 July 1990.

Resettlement of Crimean-Tatars Examined

90UN1459B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
15 Mar 90 p 3

[Ukrainian Radiotelegraph Agency (RATAU) Report: "A Program of Action is Being Elaborated"]

[Text] A meeting took place in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, at which the results of the session of the state's committee on the problems of the Crimean-Tatar nation, which was held in Moscow, and the tasks of the republic's agencies, which ensue from the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Conclusions and Proposals of the Committees on the Problems of the Soviet Germans and the Crimean-Tatar Nation" were considered. It was stressed that it is already necessary to develop within the next few months immediate measures and a comprehensive draft program for the organized resettlement of the Crimean-Tatars in the Crimean Oblast. The appropriate ministries and departments in the republic have been charged with visiting the site to consider jointly with representatives of the state committee, who arrived in the Crimea from Moscow, the proposals submitted by the Crimean Oblispolkom regarding this question.

It was emphasized that the resettlement of the Crimean-Tatars must not be artificially prompted. It must be carried out on a voluntary basis, in a organized manner, and to the extent that appropriate living conditions and jobs are created and the production of foodstuffs is increased. A number of Ukrainian SSR ministries and departments and the Crimean Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] were charged with accelerating the fulfillment of the commission from the republic's government to expand job placement service this

year as well as to solve the problem of the best way to provide building materials to the inhabitants, who have come to the Crimea.

A.S. Statinov, the deputy chairman of the State Committee on the Problems of the Crimean-Tatar Nation and the first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, spoke at the meeting.

Donetsk Oblast Political Turmoil Viewed

90UN1623A Moscow TRUD in Russian
25 Apr 90 p 2

[N. Mokrishev report: "An Alarming Spring in Donetsk"]

[Text] Donetsk—It is not only the communists but many of the inhabitants of Donetsk who are eagerly awaiting the results of the accountability-and-election conference of the oblast party organization. The eagerness has been heated by the stormy political passions that warmed up in February and March: several meetings, including unsanctioned meetings, a political strike, hunger strikes, and other actions. With the friendly support of those opposed to the present power of the informals the "Donetskugol" Association organize a strike committee.

No One Wanted to Yield

The safety fuses from the February and March flareup of political activeness reached to the halls where sessions of the newly elected soviets and stormy party meetings were taking place. I recall that the resolution of 7 February culminated in an ultimatum: In the event that the demands on resignation and abolition of the party organs are not met by 14 February, the strike committee will organize a continuous town meeting, and from 5 March there will be a citywide political strike.

And the stubborn confrontation began. Late in the evening of that same 7 February the sharply deteriorating situation in the oblast was discussed by the bureau, and by 9 February by an extraordinary plenum of the party obkom [oblast party committee]. At the first session, which was heated by political passions, there was such sharp criticism of the deteriorating life that the obkom first secretary, A. Vinnik, there and then issued a statement to the effect that he wished to resign his post "for health reasons." His wish was satisfied by a majority of the votes.

On the fourth day the plenum broke off its work in order for the first secretaries to discuss the existing situation and clarify the opinion of communists about the party obkom bureau. On 14 February the second session of the plenum started in the great hall of the House of the Soviets. It was carried live on oblast radio. And at the same time a meeting thousands strong, convened by the strike committee, roared and seethed on the square in front of the building. The raised up slogans, from the familiar "All power to the soviets!" and "Down with the party organization!" to the openly defiant "Chernigov—

Volgograd—Ufa—Donetsk... who is next?" Yellow-and-blue and black-and-white and other various colored flags were waved. There were no red ones among them. They demanded the resignation not only of the bureau but of the entire obkom apparatus. One of the leaders of the Donetsk strike committee, Yu. Boldyrev, said this from the dais of the plenum:

"Resignation of the obkom in its entirety, and immediately—this is the minimum for the relaxation of tension. And the maximum is an unfolding of events as in Romania...."

The plenum rejected the ultimatum demands of the meeting, expressed its confidence in the bureau and the apparatus, and decided to convene the accountability-and-election conference for 6 and 7 April—five weeks early.

Passions flared. There were more frequent calls for civil disobedience and for the system to be smashed. Emotions ran high right through the region. Each attack on the party workers was greeted with shouts of approval and applause. They were not able to get even two words in. It was precisely in this way that on the eve of the elections an attempt was made to discredit in the eyes of the voters the party workers who had been nominated as candidates for the posts of deputies in the local soviets.

In addition to the original demands presented as ultimatums, those meeting on 25 February had demanded that on 4 March an oblast referendum as a vote of confidence on the obkom be held simultaneously with the elections. Representatives of the public movements and political organizations proposed that they enter immediately into negotiations to conduct a joint search for ways to extricate themselves from the crisis and devise a mechanism for transferring all power to the soviets. And again a threat: There would be a political strike on 1 and 2 March if....

The Sharp Corners of the "Round Table"

I was at both roundtable meetings, attended for some reason only by the members of the obkom bureau and members of the strike committee from the "Donetskugol" Association. Unfortunately the table turned out not to be round but had sharp corners, and the dialogue was lopsided: Neither side wanted to listen to the arguments of the other.

And so no agreement was reached. The obkom bureau rejected the idea of resignation. The strike committee would not agree to postpone resolution of the matter to the conference. The action that was taken the next day smacked of pure blackmail: In the morning eight of the members of the strike committee who had participated in the talks declared a hunger strike. Wrapping themselves in blankets, they placed themselves at the entrance of the House of the Soviets. They had with them a placard that read: "Neither resolutions at meetings nor roundtable discussions were able to beat any sense into the Ukrainian Communist Party obkom! Our final step

is a hunger strike." Several miners joined them as a mark of solidarity. The same flags, slogans, and placards, and the same faces appeared in the crowd that had been seen at earlier meetings. Telegrams of support for the Donetsk strike committee, including from Moscow, the Baltic, and Vorkuta, were read aloud at the square.

There was, however, also a different reaction that the strike committee preferred not to notice: hundreds of letters and telegrams from communists and labor collectives in many of the cities and rayons who had watched the roundtable discussion on local television and had read in great detail the accounts of other events. Here are just a few of them.

"We call on those taking part in the meetings and strikes to cease the outrage and return to work. We believe that the obkom is today the only real force in accomplishing perestroika."

[Signed] The collective of the tractor repair enterprise, Krasnoarmeyskiy rayon.

"The collective of the Zuyevskiy heating and power plant supports the plenum resolution on stabilizing the situation in the oblast and strengthening discipline and law and order, and rejects the ambitious demands of the strike committee at the 'Donetskugol' Association. On instructions from the collective."

[Signed] Director Voshchenko, Deputy Secretary of the party committee Korchagin, Chairman of the labor collective council Kosharnyy, trade union Chairman Bolotin.

There was also healthy criticism. Thus, at the Mariupol Metallurgical Combine imeni Ilich, on instructions from the TRUD readers club, Cochairman V. Reshedko stated the following: "The party apparatus undoubtedly needs a major shakeup, but not using these means. It was not the strike committee of the miners in Donetsk alone that elected the obkom but the 360,000 communists in the oblast. And it is they who should decide its fate. But the obkom bureau is guilty of 'starting the cycle' in the miners' party organizations and strike committees, and of pushing the affairs and concerns of workers in other sectors into the background."

I asked Cochairman of the strike committee A. Kolomyitsev this: "Why, Aleksandr Vasilyevich, did you not agree to engage in dialogue with the obkom bureau of miners from other cities, not to mention metallurgical workers, chemical workers, construction workers, and so forth?" He replied: "We told them all what our decision was.... We are sure that they support us."

It turned out that they did not. Even the miners from the coal associations in the oblast. The strike committee obviously also failed in its attempt to start a general political strike and halt operations at enterprises. On 1 March a six-hour strike took place at only a few mines in Donetsk. Some 1,046 people (out of approximately 130,000) failed to report for work. At the other three coal associations in the oblast the numbers of those stopping work in the mines were purely symbolic (at Makeyevka,

for example, in 18 mines a total of only 212 people stopped work). And the way that the mines imeni Zasyadko and imeni Bazhanov supported the strike was to overfulfill the day's plan. Obviously, even the miners had grown tired of "radicalism." At Gorlovka and Makeyevka they reckoned that the open striving of the Donetsk strike committee for leadership had split the workers' movement.

Indeed in Donetsk itself by no means everyone approved the actions of the strike committee. This is what miners at the "Kirovskiy" said at a meeting to discuss the strike committee: "How are we to understand the fact that the strike committee at the association is sending the miners instructions and schedules—how many people we are to put on strike? Who will lead this? Who empowered the strike committee to speak always on behalf of the workers? Why are the party committees, trade unions, and labor collective councils allowing themselves to be led about by the bridle by those who have used dishonorable 'arm-twisting' methods and economic blackmail to give themselves dubious authority and bring disorder to mining affairs?"

Defeat or Victory?

"Without speaking out personally against the strike committee at the 'Donetskugol' Association, I am trying to find an explanation for why others are speaking out against it. And using this as the example, I want to understand where this spontaneous meeting movement is going...."

It was with this question that member of the strike committee L. Kalinovskaya, who came to the TRUD correspondent's office, began the letter in which she pondered the events of February. She herself reached no firm answer. But the course of her cogitations and the entire logic of the way in which events unfolded enable us to conclude that at a given stage the strike committee and the forces supporting it had already lost. Their intention to "wring the necks" of the obkom failed, for the members of the bureau of one of the largest obkoms in the country did not compromise itself in any way. The members of the strike committee forced events too much and were unable or reluctant to engage in considered dialogue and reach sensible compromises.

But this is not all. The conduct of the strike committee today cannot be compared to what occurred following last year's strike in July. Let me remind you that the strike committee was set up to work on economic demands and monitor compliance with government measures as set forth in Resolution No. 608. This time we recall no such interpretation, for today the strike committee of the Donetsk miners has shown itself to be a totally politicized organization with a leaning toward power methods, diktat, and ultimatum, in other words, under the guise of democracy it is trying to replace one kind of "conformity to ideas" with another—its own—and the miners of the "Kirovskiy" sensed this keenly. The most alarming thing is that any kind of extreme step

is being proclaimed as "the will of the people" when in fact it is nothing but resolutions adopted by meetings to the accompaniment of the shouts of about a hundred other people who are always placed at the front and are active at all meetings without exception. What is this if not exploitation of the political awakening of the masses for their own ends? What is happening on the squares and streets is not a search for the truth by a struggle for power.

Of course, the more people there are ready to stand at the helm of power the better for the power, because there is a choice. But first the methods, as you see, are by no means always honorable and pure, and second the candidates themselves who seek the role of "helmsmen" politically are not mature enough for the role in a civic sense. So that it is not by chance that the strike committee of the miners in Donetsk let loose on such a high note and disenchanted some of its own ardent supporters and well-wishers.

And there is another important observation from February and March. All our ills are without doubt to be found in the economic field. But the dissatisfaction with those ills voiced at the square in Donetsk was deliberately directed into a political channel—just like the 1940s of sad memory, when the failures in the economy were explained by the intrigues of "traitors" and "degenerates...." And all democracy was essentially reduced to one thing: give, give, give. The scholar and commentator I. Klyamkin was absolutely right when he said that democracy in a society of consumers rather than producers, where everyone pulls the blankets over himself, is possible only as the freedom to quarrel and fight. The cause of the flareup of meetings in Donetsk was a broadcast on local television about the supposed deliberate hiding of imported clothing at the "Vzuttya" firm wholesale warehouse. And although the facts were unconfirmed, the "stones are still being thrown" at the obkom.

Yes, dissatisfaction has built up in people and there is an obvious malice against the local organs of power because of the numerous social and everyday annoyances: Things are bad with housing, with medical care, it is cold in the apartments in winter, there are water shortages in the summer. The queues in the stores, the ecological ills, the failure to take effective steps against speculators, and the growth in crime—all these things are pouring oil on the flames. But these old diseases cannot be cured in an hour!

And here let us return to L. Kalinovskaya's letter. "Nevertheless, it has been possible to put in motion the rusted wheel of the local leading party mechanism," writes Ludmilla Pavlovna, "and communists in the oblast should thankful that we really forced them to act—exactly and actively...."

Well, that is true: All party strata have been rocked. There have been organizational changes: The party

bureaus in the Selidovskiy and Kirovskiy city committees and the Kuybyshev party committee (in Donetsk City) have been forced to resign, along with the raykom [rayon party committee] first secretary and the rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] chairman in Novozavodsk. Top leaders have been replaced in other cities. Communists in Amvrosiyevskiy rayon have radically altered the structure of the raykom: They have eliminated all departments and halved the size of the apparatus. At an extraordinary conference of the Gorlovka city party organization it was decided to eliminate all three raykoms before 1 May 1990. And a party conference in Donetsk City decided to replace the secretaries with a gorkom [city party committee] council. The Proletarskiy raykom at the oblast center has abolished itself; it has also replaced the secretaries with a council. A number of the party committees in the Donetsk mines have become independent in virtually everything. Finally, a start has been made on a democratic and qualitative shift in the hierarchy of the party pyramid and the long-awaited delegation of rights to the primary party organizations. Are these not radical steps from which we can expect good changes and real results?

With respect to the elections to the local soviets, here too, healthy, constructive forces have gained a victory. As an illustration of this, the cochairman of the strike committee, A. Kolomiitsev, was not elected to the republic Supreme Soviet and failed to win the vote for the post of chairman of the Donetsk city soviet, while at the same time, apart from V. Chuprun, the party obkom secretaries were deprived of their mandates as deputies.

Thus, the expected "palace coup" in Donetsk did not take place. The choice of the new leaders has been made. Another important choice has also been made, namely, the choice of path. So neither of the opposing sides has won a clear victory. So who did win? I would very much like to hope and believe that ultimately the cause won. The more so since spring is to hand—a time of expectation and hope.

Caucasus

Armenian Party Chief on Solution to Crisis

LD2404133190 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT
24 Apr 90

[Text] Yerevan April 24 TASS—Follows news from Soviet Armenia:

"The Armenian people are living through a critical time," Armenian Communist Party leader Vladimir Movsesyan told a republican party and economic activists' conference. The conference discussed the situation in the republic and ways to stabilize it.

"We have been drawn into an interethnic conflict for about a year. No constitutional solution on the right of

Armenians from Nagorno-Karabakh for self-determination has been reached. Our people have faced such problems as the earthquake and the flood of refugees," Movsesyan said.

"Some 530,000 people in the quake-hit zone have lost their homes. Over 250,000 refugees are in the same situation. This means that about a million people are homeless in a republic with a population of three and a half million people. About 350,000 people are jobless.

"In order to find a way out of the crisis and to consolidate all viable forces in the republic, we need a council of national accord. It should include renowned people and representatives of all movements and public organizations.

"It is planned to convene a national forum with representatives from the Armenian Republic, Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenian diasporas in this country and abroad. The forum will discuss and work out a programme of national revival. The Forum's organising committee should be set up immediately."

Racial Incitement Added to Criminal Code

PM2404142390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Apr 90 Morning Edition p2

[Dispatch by correspondent Asim Dzhalilov under the rubric "Direct Line": "Increased Liability"]

[Text] Baku—The Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium has introduced amendments and additions to some of the republic's legislation.

In line with the USSR Law "On Increasing Liability for Encroachments on Citizens' National Equality and Forcible Violation of the Integrity of USSR Territory" of 2 April 1990 and the USSR Law "On the Legal Regime of the State of Emergency" of 3 April 1990, the Azerbaijan SSR Code on Administrative Offenses has been supplemented by a series of articles, violation of which is punishable by large fines (up to 10,000 rubles) or administrative detention for a period of up to 15 days, assuming that criminal prosecution is not provided for by legislation in such cases.

In particular, this article covers action to form any citizens' associations, including political parties, social organizations, or mass movements, the object of whose activity is to incite national or racial enmity, discord, or contempt or the use of violence on national, racial, or religious grounds or to directly incite the forcible violation of the territorial integrity of the USSR, union and autonomous republics, and autonomous oblast and okrugs, which is enshrined in the USSR Constitution; it also covers active participation in their activity.

The same measure of punishment is provided for in another article: on ignoring the requirements of the state of emergency regime and violating the ban on holding

meetings, rallies, street marches and demonstrations, and other mass events, including strikes.

A series of amendments and additions have been introduced to the republic's criminal code. Henceforth, public appeals for the forcible overthrow or change of the Soviet state and social structure or for the forcible violation of the territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan SSR and other union republics and autonomous formations, which is enshrined in the USSR Constitution, and also the distribution of material with this kind of content are punishable by imprisonment for a period of up to three years or a fine of up to R10,000.

Moscow Weekly Accused of Bias on Baku Events

PM2304145590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 20 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Letter to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, originally sent to MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, which reportedly refused to publish it, from Colonel N. Petrushenko, USSR people's deputy, followed by his own comments, under the headline: "'No Plans for Publication...' On the Unsuccessful Attempt of a USSR People's Deputy To Voice His Objections on the Pages of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI"]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial Office has received the following communication:

Issue no. 7 (18 February this year) of the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI carried an article by movie director S. Govorukhin on the January events in Baku. It seemed to me to be largely unobjective, contradictory, and capable of misleading both the Soviet and foreign reader to whom this newspaper is also addressed. I set out my opinion on this matter in a letter to the MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI Editorial Office.

In view of the fact that it refused to publish my letter, I hereby ask KRASNAYA ZVEZDA to publish this letter and some of my own comments.

"Esteemed MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI Editorial Office!

"I felt bitter after reading the article by Stanislav Govorukhin, 'Rehearsal?', published in your newspaper. It was prefaced by the rubric 'Eyewitness Testimony.' Well, I too am an eyewitness of the events in Baku. I flew there on my own initiative immediately after the state of emergency was introduced. Exercising my right as an eyewitness and USSR people's deputy, I will allow myself to express some opinions on the aforementioned article.

"I will not venture to comment on everything written by Govorukhin. Yes, I too am perplexed as to why no one in Azerbaijan sounded the alarm when they knew of the approaching pogroms. I too cannot understand why the Azerbaijani intelligentsia, the republic's people's deputies, and party and soviet organs remained silent. Now that the state has taken emergency measures to protect

democracy, law and order, and the safety of its own citizens, many of the above are complaining more loudly than anyone else about the blood that was shed. Together with them we grieve for the victims—but where were you before, comrades? Why did you not rise up against the thugs who were totally blatant about supplying themselves with weapons, even manufacturing them in the workshops of state enterprises? Why did you remain silent when, at a thousands-strong rally held in Baku before the introduction of the state of emergency, words were heard which, as recorded in the stenographic report and read out to the USSR Supreme Soviet as evidence of the Azerbaijani nationalists' extremism, still seem incredible nevertheless: '...Today we appeal to all bribe-takers, to all millionaires, and to the mafia with this one request: Give us weapons, weapons, weapons!'

"Today, when the tragedy has already taken place, many people in Baku would seem to prefer to forget that four gallows were erected quite blatantly, in broad daylight, in the square in front of the republic's Central Committee building several days before the tragedy. Some local journalists with whom I spoke were inclined to see them as symbolic. But the ropes on these gallows were the real thing. To forget about all this would not just be an unforgivable oversimplification of the January events in Azerbaijan: It would be tantamount to distorting the truth.

"But I categorically disagree with Govorukhin's attempt to portray the enforced introduction of troops into Baku as a punitive expedition and the Soviet soldiers and officers as occupationists. Tell me, what riches were seized by these 'occupationists' in Azerbaijan? For the sake of what did almost 40 servicemen give their lives—not at the front but in their own country? For the sake of what have more than 100 of them been maimed and injured? I have been there and I know for the sake of what: for the sake of ensuring that the republic returns to normal life at last and that there is an end to the bloodshed by Armenians in its streets and squares and by Azerbaijanis on Armenian soil. And for the sake of ensuring that those people devoid of honor and conscience who are still intimidating the people of Baku, threatening reprisals against those reluctant to strike, and placing their political ambitions above the interests of their own people do not come to feel themselves the masters of the Transcaucasus.

"I have seen with my own eyes that it is characters like these who still rule the roost in a number of regions of Azerbaijan. In the very difficult days after the introduction of the state of emergency I walked around Baku in my military uniform and met with its inhabitants. Sometimes my interlocutors became extremely emotional, and at times like those only the badge of USSR people's deputy was able to prevent unpleasantness. But when they had calmed down, many of them said: Yes, a terrible tragedy has happened. However, we must work and put our lives in order. We would be glad to return to our workplaces, the people are tired of the social

upheavals of recent years. But we are afraid... You will go away, but we have to live here.

"I still receive many letters from people living in the Azerbaijani capital. Some condemn the introduction of troops into the city. What is surprising, however, is this: Some of the letters appear to have been written under dictation. In any case the textual coincidences are beyond doubt.

"However, there are also many letters whose authors are grateful to the military and support the measures taken by the government. People understand that their lives have become calmer and safer since 20 January. They simply ask that their surnames not be published. They are afraid.

"Their fears are not unfounded. In a number of places real power still belongs to extremists from the People's Front rather than to party and soviet organs. It is precisely for this reason, fearing revenge from them and not because of the state of emergency, that working people are still on strike at a number of Baku enterprises.

"I can feel nothing but outrage at Govorukhin's interpretation of the automobile catastrophe in which three scientists died as deliberate brutality and vandalism by the military. In his opinion, it was premeditated murder. A monstrous lie! Yes, the catastrophe happened. It was not a tank at all but an armored personnel carrier (infantry combat vehicle—editorial note) that in fact crashed into the Zhiguli with its three passengers. However, the driver made no attempt to flee the scene of the incident. The measure of his guilt will be established by the inquiry. There also was no tank column which, according to the author, 'went out to crush an enemy who had become firmly established in the city.' Surely such lack of moderation is unforgivable?

"Allow me to sum up. This publication is either an example of an irresponsible attitude toward the printed word or a deliberate attempt to set our army and our people in opposition to one another and portray members of the military as some callous robots prepared to murder women and children when ordered to do so. Who needs this deliberate lie, and why? And how is it to be interpreted today, in particular, when, by dint of circumstances, the army is forced time and again to act as the last barrier between mobs seized with nationalist frenzy, and when thousands of people see the army as their last hope and defense? Maybe it should be seen as incitement to remove even this barrier from the extremists' path? Where will this lead us?

"In conclusion, esteemed editorial office, allow me to express my confidence that you will be able to find the opportunity to publish my letter as another eyewitness account of the events in Baku. This would accord with the traditions of glasnost and pluralism." [letter ends]

[Petrushenko commentary] I feel I must add this to the above. The letter was received by MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 22 February. Approximately two weeks later

I called in at the editorial office to see what had happened to it. I was told that the letter had been sent to... S. Govorukhin and that there were no plans for publication. Not being versed in newspaper ethics, I nevertheless expressed sincere amazement at this turn of events and asked that the letter be returned to me with the reasons for its rejection. The response, signed by Chief Editor Ye. Yakovlev, was dated 29 March.

In his response he made the following point, in particular: "Publication of your letter has been delayed because the letters department wanted to publish it together with a follow-up article by Govorukhin, in whose possession your letter was at the time of your visit to the editorial office." This prompts several questions. Question number one. Surely the fate of a reader's letter is not solely dependent on what the letters department "wants" or "does not want"? What, in that case, is the role of the editorial collegium and the chief editor? Question number two. Why must the possibility of publishing a letter by one person be considered "in tandem" with a follow-up article by another?

In his response he goes on to say that it is not a very good idea to return to these tragic events today. What can I say? No one prevented the editorial office from promptly publishing my material when the question of its advisability could not have arisen. Incidentally, for some reason this question did not arise when they published the article by S. Govorukhin with its unverified facts.

In principle, it really is best not to return to tragic events. I know that life in Baku is now getting back to normal and I sincerely hope that this process is irreversible. I hope that no one will see this appeal of mine to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA as an attempt to rub salt into the wounds. It is not just that it is unforgivable to remain silent when readers are deliberately misinformed. It is no secret that accusations leveled at the army in keeping with those made in the article "Rehearsal?" can now be heard in various places. I am convinced that the influence of articles such as these is making itself felt here. There is also another reason that compelled me to return to my unsuccessful attempt to express my opinion in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. In the past I had my doubts about the opinion now fairly widespread and well established among members of the military that that newspaper takes a tendentious, one-sided approach to coverage of army problems. But my own personal experience has dispelled these doubts once and for all. Especially as publications written in this spirit have appeared recently. All this forces me to decline at present Ye. Yakovlev's proposal of cooperation—a proposal made, I believe, as compensation "for the moral damage caused"—with the editorial office, via the "Free Tribune" page, in particular. I have seen for myself that MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is a tribune that is not free to all.

And the last point. The Supreme Soviet session is soon to adopt the law on the press. I believe that my bitter experience is further confirmation of how important it is

for the law to stipulate press organs' responsibility for objectivity of information and for honesty in their relationships with authors.

Col. N. Petrushenko, USSR People's Deputy

Baku Leaders Attend Lenin Birthday Ceremony

NC2404115490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 20 Apr 90

[Text] Party, soviet, and social organizations in Baku and Soviet Army representatives held a jubilant ceremony on 20 April in the Lenin Palace to mark the 120th birthday anniversary of V. Lenin, the eternal leader of the proletariat. The representatives of the party, war, and work veterans, leading production workers, scientific societies, youth, and the fighters of the Baku Garrison gathered in the hall.

Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; El'mira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium; and Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; and other republic party and government leaders attended the meeting's chairmanship council. Agayev, first secretary of the Baku City Party Committee, opened the meeting.

After the national anthems of the Soviet Union and Azerbaijan SSR were played, V. Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the meeting.

Gumbaridze Meets With KGB, Ministry Officials

90US0769B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
23 Mar 90 pp 1-2

[Report by the Press Center of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee: "To Resolutely Put an End to Violations of the Law, to Ensure Proper Public Order!"]

[Text] G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, and N. Chitanava, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, met on 21 March with the leadership of the Committee for State Security, the Procuracy, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, and main services and subdivisions of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD].

An extremely tense situation has come to exist in the republic. A certain power vacuum has developed whereby many provisions of the laws in effect and the Georgian SSR Constitution are not complied with, and state, labor, and public discipline decline. The people have come to feel the lack of social and civil protection and of confidence in the future, in the ability of the authorities to put things in order and put an end to the unlawful, anticonstitutional activities of individual groups of people who deliberately strive to destabilize the situation.

The instances of vandalism, defamation of the symbols of statehood, violent seizure of premises of the party, soviet, and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organs, which are an outrage as far as most of the population is concerned and which have nothing in common with democratic norms and political pluralism, remain without a response.

Against this background criminal elements and groups have sharply stepped up their activities. The number of murders, severe bodily injuries, bandit assaults, muggings, theft, and malicious hooliganism has increased considerably. The criminals are becoming more insolent, increasingly operate in the open, and commit in full view of the people impudent and cynical actions which sometimes run into no organized resistance. The dealers of the "shadow economy" have begun to steal people's assets less openly but in an increasingly insolent and shameless manner.

In an environment of artificially fueled fear, chaos, anarchy, and even moral terror against a certain category of people, many honest and upstanding citizens give up the struggle, take a position of noninterference, and respond passively to abuses and to white-collar and economic crime.

The main issue concerning the people in conjunction with this is: Will rampant violence and crime be brought to an end? How long are the law enforcement organs going to wait? What does all of this have to do with the political methods of struggle for restoring national statehood, social and political awakening of the people, and finally, democracy?

A frank and sharp discussion held at the meeting was helpful in figuring out these complex problems to a considerable degree. Indeed, we should appreciate the efforts of the employees of the organs of state security, internal affairs, procuracy, and justice: They continue to perform their duties under the most complex conditions and, in cooperation with the party and soviet organs, prevent and avert dangerous designs which could have brought our society to the brink of a catastrophe and bloodshed long ago. This part of their work is not always visible. However, the citizens of the republic should know that using nontraditional methods and frequently performing functions that are not properly theirs, the organs of law enforcement control the situation on the whole, and that they have managed to maintain unity, mobility, and tenacity.

However, nobody has a right to be complacent if the law is not complied with in many instances, if constitutional norms are rudely flouted, if the population still does not feel safe. The law enforcement organs are responsible for the future of perestroika and the process of democratic renewal even more than the most active segment of society, even more than the state organs. They should operate only on the basis of precise and unconditional compliance with the law, which is facilitated to a considerable degree by the introduction of presidential

power in the country and the recently growing awareness of the citizens of the republic who have begun to draw a distinction between truly national forces, feelings, and interests, and the aspirations of destructive forces which pass themselves off as expressing the will of the people while actually standing for their exact opposite.

Participants in the meeting stated with regret that, along with traditional shortcomings in the work of the law enforcement organs—lack of professionalism, incompetence, passivity, and moral degeneration of some of the cadres—in the new situation, there is also the feeling of lack of social protection and lack of new material and technical resources for combating criminals who are sometimes better equipped than those who defend the law and democracy. The work of the militia and other law enforcement organs is unfavorably affected by the absence of a clear position of their leaders in many cases, delays in the resolution of issues, the tendency to wait, and insufficient independence in their activities and responsibility at all levels of management.

The militia and other law enforcement organs may be called devoted to the people only if they ensure unconditional compliance with law and order and create a calm legal background against which alone a democratic resolution of all economic, political, and national issues in the republic is possible.

The government, the supreme organ of state power, no longer intends to put up with the way law and order are maintained in the republic. We have come to the dangerous line beyond which our society will slip into the depths of violence, chaos, and lawlessness. It was stressed at the meeting that a moment may come when it will be impossible to arrest these processes. The laws should apply despite all the shouting, pressure, and threats from those who are afraid of this the most. In the course of this, the law should reliably protect the employees of the law enforcement organs themselves.

The rapid development of the democratic process puts on the agenda the preparation of new legal acts, their propagation and clarification, and a sharp improvement in the legal culture and knowledge of the populace, primarily the young. While participating in some actions, they are not always aware of the fact that they are grossly violating the law or of the legal consequences of actions endangering the life and safety of other citizens.

The Ministry of Justice should take a stand in this matter; much to our regret it has not yet become a combat headquarters for law creation and interpretation. The most radical measures will be taken in order to correct the existing situation.

The participants in the meeting reviewed the situation emerging in trade, in the entire network of storing, registering, and selling products, and in certain other spheres of economic operations. Specific examples were given of corrupt elements, representatives of organized crime, and mafia groups which have taken up positions

in trade, economic management, and the sphere of distribution and, hiding behind the slogans of the national movement, have exacerbated existing shortages, manipulated public opinion, and financed suspect groups, skillfully accomplishing their goals with the assistance of the latter, pursuing their political ambitions, and striving to seize the sphere of management. While thus discrediting the national movement, the tycoons of "the shadow economy" in many cases corrupt the people who initially set for themselves lofty goals and noble tasks.

The apparatus for combating the embezzlement of socialist property and other MVD services have an opportunity to reveal these people's true colors, and not only to put an end to flourishing speculation, bribery, and theft but to also get to the source of underground business and the roots of organized crime. They should take advantage of this potential in the nearest future.

The availability of great amounts of firearms to the criminal elements justifiably concerns both the populace and the state organs. Meanwhile little is being done to confiscate the firearms, prevent their theft, manufacture, and carrying, and prosecute those who keep and store them. An opinion was stated at the meeting that it is necessary for the skilled apparatus of KGB investigators to participate in this significant work as well as certain other types of investigations and inquests.

The work of the Administration for the Protection of Public Order and the State Motor Vehicle Inspection of the MVD also drew sharp criticism. Elementary order is lacking on city streets, primarily in Tbilisi. Officers of the patrol and guard service and of the State Motor Vehicles Inspection are virtually absent. Violations of public order and traffic rules have become massive. The State Motor Vehicle Inspection has, in effect, abandoned performing its duties; motor vehicle traffic is not regulated or controlled, and the number of traffic and vehicle accidents has been growing rapidly, as has the number of victims.

The participants in the meeting also addressed the issue of giving support and aid to the law enforcement organs, primarily the militia, in the successful accomplishment of the tasks of protecting public order and stepping up the fight against crime. It is necessary to speed up the implementation of the measures aimed at creating additional subunits of the organs of internal affairs, and the municipal militia, which have been initiated in Tbilisi, Kutaisi, and a number of other regions. The leadership of the Georgian SSR MVD and the Administration of Internal Affairs of the Tbilisi City Executive Committee should urgently submit specific proposals to the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers concerning the allocation of additional staff personnel, motor vehicles, and proper equipment for outfitting the militia organs. These requests will be considered on a priority basis and met as far as possible by the government of the republic.

It is also very important to inform the people objectively and in a timely manner about the real-time situation and the measures taken with a view to stabilizing it. However, the information services of law enforcement organs, primarily the press center of the MVD, operate poorly; there is no regularity in the supply of information. Presentations by the leading functionaries of the law enforcement organs on particular current issues in reinforcing the law and legal order are rare. The republic press, TV, and radio frequently disorient the people by failing to make any assessment of clearly unlawful and destabilizing actions.

We should understand clearly that no numerical increment of the militia staff or improvements in its equipment will accomplish a turnaround in fighting crime and violations of public order unless the employees of all law enforcement organs take a correct, aggressive, and principled position.

If we want all citizens of the future democratic, rule-of-law society, of the free and independent republic, to have confidence in their future and the exercise of their rights, the law enforcement organs should learn right now to carry out just one order and lean on just one force—the force of the law and the democratic constitution.

New forms of the supervision of law enforcement organs, primarily by the soviet offices, local soviets, and the political work of the party organs of the Communist Party of Georgia and other public organizations on establishing proper order in the new conditions, were also discussed at the meeting. The following idea was stated: Political forms of work, dialogue, and sharing your views with those who subscribe to different opinions and actions cannot by any means replace the tasks and operations of law enforcement organs.

A decision to improve the coordination of such operations was made at the meeting. A number of decisions of the supreme organ of state power, the government of the republic, made recently with public opinion taken into account, provide a reliable foundation for stabilizing the sociopolitical situation in Georgia and for shifting the emphasis to accomplishing priority national, political, and economic tasks. The time has come to consider seriously our choice of path, and for all healthy forces in our society to act vigorously in the defense of the democratic process and the establishment of genuine political pluralism. The law enforcement organs of the republic should and will become a significant guarantor of stability and order during this complex period.

[Signed] Press Center of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee

Gumbaridze Speaks on Current Issues

90US0770B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
25 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "A Statement on Georgian Television by G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Republic

Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The statement covered current issues of the republic's and country's sociopolitical development at a qualitatively new level and at an extremely crucial stage in the further deepening of the process of democratization, the creation of a rule-of-law state, the republic's political and economic sovereignty, the consolidation of society, and strengthening public law and order, when each person should draw his own conclusions and bring his own actions and his own words and deeds into line with the true interests of the people.

G. Gumbaridze noted that the decisions of the latest, extraordinary session of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on carrying over the date of the elections was the result of a desire to deepen the democratic process in Georgia, develop true democratic cooperation, and establish political pluralism and a multiparty system. Thus we have laid true democratic foundations for the election campaign and each person has equal opportunities to take part in the elections both as a candidate and a voter. Of course, we shall not get by in the election campaign without the regrettable shortcomings and tendentiousness whereby some candidates have failed to avoid the temptation of setting out on the path of discrediting their rivals, partners, and opponents. There have not always been adequate political standards, and there has been failure to observe many of the conditions of political cooperation that are recognized throughout the civilized world. But these have been isolated derelictions, and we must rid ourselves of them.

It was noted in the statement that the chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium personally passed on all the most important documents adopted at the extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the country's leadership. In the law passed by the Third USSR Congress of People's Deputies full consideration was given to the criticisms and ideas of principle expressed at the republic Supreme Soviet session. It also says that M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR and CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, met at his own request with the deputation from Georgia and promised support in the resolution for the problems that are justifiably worrying our people and the entire people.

G. Gumbaridze emphasized that a largely new and complex stage has started in our lives, which demands a great sense of responsibility from each person. It should be a secret to no one that trends have recently been growing which, if they are not stopped, will not only not help but will even bring to the brink of destruction the process of democratization and the creation of a free, democratic society.

It can be clearly sensed that people are worried. They are speaking out increasingly loudly about the escalation of force, and about corrupt elements that are hiding behind

the cover of national ideals and various public movements and groups, but are in fact discrediting them. All of this is casting a shadow over noble civic and public goals.

G. Gumbaridze noted that no one has the right to encourage the kind of processes that threaten the future of the people, the civic world, and the accord. Each of us must recognize with a full sense of responsibility the context within which public life has of late been developing in Georgia, and must necessarily take this into account. The senseless desire for confrontation is sometimes incomprehensible at a time when real prerequisites have created for cooperation, the exchange of opinions, consolidation, and constructive dialogue. Despite the permanent nature of the tension along the path to real sovereignty and independence for the republic, many real steps have been taken. Examples of this include the decisions of the last three sessions of the Supreme Soviet, the halting of ecologically dangerous construction and new construction sites in Samtskhe-Dzhavakheti and Kvemo Kartli, work on the state programs to resolve painful problems relating to the development of the Georgian language, culture and history, and the concept of national development formed jointly with the public, its gradual implementation, and much else. A whole series of legislative drafts that underpin the legal foundations of our political, economic, and spiritual development is being prepared and will be submitted for public debate and approval by the republic parliament. Of course, much more still remains to be done, and we must traverse a long and complicated path.

It was emphasized in the statement that much has been done, but even more remains to be done so that the traditional interethnic relations in Georgia retain the same sacred and pure form that they have had over the millennia. It is essential to preserve our brotherhood, which must become one of the foundations of independent development.

Unfortunately today such aspirations are sometimes being opposed by irresponsible appeals and statements that evoke misgivings among the public. There are forces and people for whom, it seems, no laws exist. For whom constitutions are not obligatory. No one has a right to violate the law, and whoever acts outside the law should also be clear as to where such a position and attitude may lead.

It was emphasized in the statement that we should not try to dismember the nation along social, political, or religious lines. No one has the right to proclaim that the organs of power, or the party and other organizations are criminal or unlawful. This is the more intolerable at a time when we are developing a rule-of-law state, and such calls should be assessed as actions directed against legality and democracy. And when we add to all this the unwarranted seizure of buildings belonging to state and public organizations, vandalism and the defiling of monuments, and the number of acts of hooliganism, this all qualifies as criminal behavior. It is no secret that the

acts, unacceptable for civilized people, that are being perpetrated by some of our fellow citizens are evoking a sharply negative reaction not only in the republic and country but even abroad. No one has been given the right to insult Georgia and its prestige, or the dignity of its people.

The appropriate conclusions should be drawn from this, and we should be fully aware of our responsibility and help to resolve problems that are of vital importance for our people and republic. And when this is done, monopoly claims to the truth and to patriotism, and a monopoly of political position and public opinion, and also instigation for the restoration of tyranny, are intolerable.

We must restrain from hasty, superficial, and amateurish assessments of the many political and economic problems that are so important for the republic, which often create political illusions and bring nothing good for Georgia. Georgia is a rich country that has great economic potential, but today the reality is such that we may not carve out a path for ourselves at a time when the republic's economy requires fundamental reconstruction, when we obtain from outside one-fourth of the electric power that we need, 90 percent of oil, 100 percent of natural gas, 93 percent of rolled ferrous metals and steel pipes, 82 percent of timber, 40 percent of meat, 76 percent of milk, 94 percent of grain, and 98 percent of sugar. Of course, the republic does export tea, wine, citrus fruit, manganese and other products, but it is necessary to consider carefully that this is all balanced, and what we can expect tomorrow and the day after tomorrow if no scientifically sound predictions have been made. This very important work is now being intensively worked on.

Because of this the republic's achievement of full independence cannot be a one-time act, cannot happen just because there are appeals and a certain exaltation. It is a stage-by-stage process that will become possible when all the people invest in this cause their desires, abilities, soul, and all their efforts; when a high scientific level and a legal foundation for this have been achieved.

In conclusion G. Gumbaridze expressed his conviction that today all the conditions have been created in the republic for mobilizing the intellectual forces of the people, exploiting the broad democratic possibilities and the atmosphere of constructive dialogue, political pluralism, cooperation, mutual respect, and the growing sense of responsibility among all strata of the population, not only to mark out the true landmarks for Georgia's political, economic, social, and spiritual development, but also to ensure in a realistic manner the realization of the vital interests and goals of the whole people.

Future of Georgian Komsomol Discussed

90US0769A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
23 Mar 90 p 4

[Report by the Georgian Information Agency: "The Congress Has Completed Its Proceedings"]

[Text] An extraordinary congress of the Georgian Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] did not come up with an unequivocal answer to a question of concern for the public of the republic: Is the Komsomol of Georgia going to discontinue its operations or remain, and in which form?

Among other things a resolution adopted by the congress notes: "Since the day it was founded the Komsomol of Georgia was deprived of independence; it virtually had the status of a division of first the Russian and then the All-Union Komsomol organization. Now that all of Georgia has set for itself the goal of restoring its independence and statehood we, the participants in the congress, confirm the separation of the Komsomol and make the decision to conduct a process of self-determination of the organizational structure of the Komsomol."

A view was stated at the congress that it is necessary to liquidate the Komsomol. This is why the self-determination of all Komsomol organizations up to their self-dissolution is to occur before 1 June of this year.

The congress charged a specially established commission, also operating until 1 June, to ensure coordination and develop a mechanism for the self-determination of the Komsomol of Georgia. Before this deadline every Komsomol member of the republic should state his position depending on which organization he wants to belong to, or just leave the Komsomol.

Those who have not determined their position by 1 June will be considered to have left the Komsomol.

Youth organizations set up pursuant to the legislation in effect are the successors of the Komsomol's real estate endowed with full rights throughout this period.

The congress liquidated republic, oblast, city, and rayon pioneer councils. As far as the pioneer and Komsomol organizations of schools are concerned, it is proposed that they make their own decisions concerning self-determination and the future of their organizations.

A decision of the Georgia Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee Bureau on renaming the newspapers was also confirmed: AKHALGAZRDA KOMUNISTI is to become AKHALGAZRDA IVERI-ELI, NORCHI LENINELI—NERGI, and the journal PIONERI—NAKADULI.

After the congress ended, some of the young people who remained in the auditorium proposed setting up an action group for forming a new public organization—a movement of the free youth of Georgia.

Goals of Georgian 'National Accord' Discussed

90US0770A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
25 Mar 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Aleksandr Rusetskiy, president of the Georgian "National Accord," by Eka Akhalkatsi; date and place not specified: "How To Reach Agreement"]

[Text] The "National Accord" of the Association of the People's Front of Georgia is an association of patriots of Georgia whose goal is not only to strengthen mutual understanding between the representatives of the various nationalities living in the republic and with the Georgian population, but also to unite all democratic forces around the Georgian national-liberation movement as a means of achieving national accord, since they believe that it is precisely this movement that will serve as a powerful stimulus for democratic transformations in the republic. Yes, the energetic young men from the association have taken up what is, let us be candid, not an easy burden. How are they going to reach their goal? In search of an answer to this question I met with Aleksandr Rusetskiy, president of the "National Accord."

[Akhalkatsi] Sasha, you have been leading the association since November of last year, that is from the first days of its existence. Of course it is still rather early to be talking about the results of your work, but you and your colleagues must already have gained some experience in this direction. And so this is my first question: What in your opinion is chiefly to blame for the alienation of non-Georgians?

[Rusetskiy] Total misunderstanding of the essential nature, meaning, and purport of the national movement in Georgia, which is today experiencing a sharp upswing. Of course, how can you support something of which you are unaware? You can see for yourself how complex the stage was that is now behind us—within the republic a multiparty system has been officially sanctioned, but the inhabitants who do not speak Georgian have no idea about the aims and tasks of the various sociopolitical formations. The rest have only "scraps" of information about them. Incidentally, this circumstance has been used very skillfully, and is still being used, by the representatives of the "third force;" it has by no means been playing last fiddle in the incitement of interethnic conflicts. Therefore, at the present stage our main goal is to carry out enlightenment work, if I may put it that way. To explain to the representatives of the various ethnic groups living in Georgia the essence and—the main thing—the goal of the national-liberation movement.

It is essential that they understand this, namely that the reactionary forces trying to create among non-Georgians, and indeed even among Georgians and in countries abroad, a false image of our national-liberation movement, depicting it as a chauvinist movement, and are interfering in the peaceful development of events and undermining the age-old traditions of friendship

between the peoples of Georgia, trying to set one against the other. And this is fatal for everyone without exception "in terms of national affiliation." Incidentally, it is mainly those who have not managed to clarify the existing situation for themselves who are suffering the most.

Proceeding from this, we believe that the most important thing is to help all ethnic groups in the republic to determine for themselves whether or not they will play the role of puppets in the hands of those dark forces that are hostile to them, or whether they will stand with the Georgian people...

[Akhalkatsi] "National accord" is an association organized by the republic People's Front. Does this mean that you are deprived of independence?

[Rusetskiy] Of course not. While we express the interests of and fully share the charter and program of the People's Front of Georgia, at the same time we have every right to pursue an independent policy. The goal-oriented activity of the association is managed by interim or standing commissions that we set up as required. In turn, they are empowered to recruit experts on particular subjects for our work. So now we have a group of sociologists working for us. The main purpose of the poll that they are conducting is to clarify people's opinions on the reasons for the ethnic crises, and to elucidate people's positions with respect to the activity of the various sociopolitical formations.

Our newspaper NATSIONALNOYE SOGLASIYE, printed in the republic language, which I hope will soon find its way through the barriers of the bureaucratic apparatus, will inform readers about the course of the national-liberation movement in the republic.

[Akhalkatsi] But all of this is theory. What practical steps are you and your colleagues taking to achieve agreement between the nations?

[Rusetskiy] First, let me take this opportunity to invite all "uncommitted" people to join us, our association. As far as our specific actions are concerned, we are constantly visiting the various regions of Georgia and meeting with people and explaining and convincing... We were in South Ossetia in those difficult days; we are often in Abkhazia. Incidentally, a branch of the "National Accord" will soon be set up in Sukhumi. It has become clear that in Abkhazia there are many among the Abkhaz, Russian, and Armenian populations who want to study the Georgian language. The People's Front of Georgia and the All-Georgian Rustaveli Society are starting courses to study Georgian in several parts of Abkhazia. We have sent them a batch of textbooks.

[Akhalkatsi] As far as I know the members of the religious sects [dukhobory] are about to leave Georgia. What is the position of the association members with respect to this issue?

[Rusetskiy] During the period of Soviet power thousands of villages were left deserted but are now being revived. And it is precisely for this reason that the dukhobory are leaving; in my opinion this is an expression of their patriotism. With respect to the question of people emigrating from Georgia, we believe that all those who lived on its territory for so many years and made a definite contribution to the development of its agriculture, industry, and so forth should, when they leave our republic, retain their love for the country that for so many years replaced their own motherland. As far as we are able we shall help them.

We do not recognize the political parties that are being set according to national affiliation. For it is clear that this will lead to unification of them into groupings whose activity will be directed against the national-liberation movement in Georgia. We believe that there are more than enough political formations on republic territory, in whose work people can and should participate regardless of their national affiliation or religious beliefs. It is therefore essential not to divide people into Georgians and non-Georgians but to proceed from the premise that Georgia is unified and that we all have a single goal, and that each person is obliged to do whatever is in his power to reach it.

[Akhalkatsi] Sasha, at this time rumors are circulating in the city that the People's Front of Georgia is disbanding itself. Is this true?

[Rusetskiy] The People's Front of Georgia is one of the strongest organizations representing the republic national-liberation movement and fighting for democratic transformations. Since it has been in existence it has done an enormous amount of work, something that none of the other existing political parties can boast. At the same time the People's Front of Georgia has made some mistakes. I think that the main reason for this has been the fact the People's Front was open to everyone and so many "elements" joined that acted without the agreement of the front board, which undermined the authority not only of the People's Front of Georgia but also the entire national-liberation movement in the republic. And here it should be noted that according to our information a group of hooligans and adventurers that to this day have not been punished as they deserve have been acting throughout Georgian territory in the name of the front. I think that there will soon be a People's Front of Georgia congress, one of whose tasks will be to rid itself of such people.

Here is information on the association: Tbilisi, David Agmashenebeli Prospect 103, telephone 95-26-52 (any day except Sunday, 1600 to 2000 hours). The telephone numbers for the coordinating center are 96-15-14; 23-27-49; 23-11-89.

Bank account: Mtatsmindskiy (Kalininskiy) Zhilsotsbank, 100700831.

Central Asia

Conference Decides To Replace Party Officials

PM2604151390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent Vladimir Kuleshov report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Secretaries Had To Go"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—A conference of communists of the Turkmen capital has unanimously adopted a decision to replace three secretaries of Ashkhabad Gorkom [City Party Committee] at once.

This is how S. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, commented on the situation which has taken shape in the city party organization:

"Today we must assess the work of leaders of the republic's party organs also by what is on our store counters. If they are empty, this means that the secretary of the gorkom or the rayon party committee is primarily responsible. And this is what happened in Ashkhabad at the end of March: The bases, warehouses, and refrigerators were full of meat products and there were stocks, but the store counters were empty. And the chief point is that no one was put out or concerned about the situation, as though that was how it should be..."

Of course, it is not a matter just of meat, which suddenly disappeared from Ashkhabad stores for no apparent reason. It is a matter of the indifference of the people responsible for supplying the city with everything necessary, of the leaders' apathy toward the problems of increasingly imminent social and domestic situations.

Ministry of Health Notes AIDS Figures

LD3004142890

[Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian in its 20 April 1990 issue on page four carries an interview with V. Genis, chief epidemiologist at the Kirghizian Ministry of Health. Genis says 14 foreign AIDS carries have already been identified in the republic and have been deported. Among the confirmed AIDS carriers were two men from Zambia who tested positive in January. The republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs assisted in tracking down over 20 of their partners, all of whom produced negative AIDS test results, Genis notes.

Genis notes there are plans to open AIDS testing centers in practically all of the republic's towns and rayon centers. Most towns already have clinics where people can be anonymously tested if they wish.

Genis says the republic is to be supplied with around 20 million disposable syringes. In 1989 it received 5.5 billion. In fact it needs between 45 and 80 million. The problem of increasing condom supplies to the republic has yet to be resolved, he says.

Kirghiz Chairman Interviewed on Unity

PM0205121590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 May 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy A. Masaliyev, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, by Colonel A. Ladin; date, place not specified: "No One Can Survive Alone"]

[Text] [Ladin] Today scarcely anyone will be surprised at the fact that, with the approach of another nationwide red-letter day, fury is flaring up with new force among certain persons and groups of people who are very hostile toward the Soviet Union. There is boundless malevolence and dozens of facts and arguments are being hunted out in order, for the umpteenth time, to daub with mud our recent past. There are also many attempts to belittle the importance of the Soviet people's victory in the war. What things you hear and read! The bourgeois ideologist (O. Kerou) once claimed: Had Kirghizia and the other Central Asian republics been independent, they could have not taken part in the war and have avoided loss of life. Time is passing, but similar claims are again being repeated with new force and now by new people.

[Masaliyev] Of course, it is very annoying that both our homegrown historians and political scientists have taken up such a dishonorable and frankly unpatriotic cause, echoing the "indictments" of outright anti-Sovietists. You find claims of the pointlessness of the losses along with a republic-by-republic breakdown, allegations of the existence of alternative plans for the main operations on certain fronts, opinions regarding repressions against command personnel for freethinking... There is absolutely nothing missing from this stew of facts and fantasies. But today you cannot refute such things merely by brushing them aside as ridiculous.

Today there is a need for honest discussion by historians and scientists who have now realized the extent of their, I would say, epochal responsibility to the country and the people for an objective depiction of our past stripped of timeserving accretions. I emphasize: a worthy past, though certainly a hard and in some respects very bitter one. A past worthy of pride and respect. I will never agree with the claim—and it is precisely this that they are now trying to foist on us—that there is nothing in the past for present and future generations of Soviet people to be proud of. Today the chronicle of the first days of the war, when people mobilized themselves to defend the country in every city, settlement, ail [Kirghiz rural administrative division], and remote pasture does not even require comment. Volunteers flocked to every military commissariat in Kirghizia. Surely that is worthy of their grandsons' pride?

[Ladin] Nevertheless, the critics of our past have a rational argument when they say that the war with Germany taught us many lessons. That is incontestable.

What lessons would you single out as the most significant today, Absamat Masaliyevich?

[Masaliyev] I would single out a lesson that the critics of the past prefer not to "dilate on." Namely the lesson of unity. Hitler greatly hoped to split our state, being convinced that at the first defeats of the Red Army, not only would the national formations run off, but the republics would also go. Each nation would flee into its own corner—and then the Soviet Union could be torn to pieces. The calculation failed. The peoples rose to form an insuperable wall in the enemy's path. There is a lot of criticism nowadays about various things, for instance, the setbacks during the initial period of the war. Of course, we must discuss everything openly and honestly, reveal miscalculations and the reasons for them, and learn from the mistakes. However, in the heat of debate we must not belittle the importance of our people's victory over the enemy. That has always been and will continue to be a subject of our national pride and a symbol of the Soviet peoples' fraternal unity.

[Ladin] The servicemen's exploit during the war years is particularly revered in Kirghizia. Few villages and ails have no memorials recording the names of local people who died in the fighting against the fascists.

[Masaliyev] That's right. Kirghizia was a long way from the front line. Deep in the rear. But for every minute of the war the republic was inseparable from the fighting units of the active army. Some 363,000 people of various nationalities and professions left their peacetime jobs and took up arms. And they joined the ranks of various units and formations, including those that were formed on the republic's territory. Some 12,700 Kirghiz communists and over 80,000 Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] members took part in the fighting. There is probably no family in our republic that does not have photographs, documents, and combat awards of participants in the war. The war affected everyone. For instance, my elder brother fought outside Moscow. He was wounded and became an invalid. And, you will agree, could any one of the Soviet republics have gotten on top of Hitler's mighty military machine, which had many European states captured by the fascists working for it? No one would have been able to rebuff it alone. That is obvious. But it is precisely this obvious fact that the opponents of socialism are now trying to ignore. From the first days of the war the Communist Party was a kind of magnet around which all the Soviet peoples united and rallied still more closely. Misfortune had struck our common home—and we all joined battle against the enemy together. I have already mentioned the volunteers who besieged local military commissariats, demanding that they be sent to the front immediately. There were thousands of them. They were the reliable backbone of the 40th and 153d Rifle Brigades and the 107th, 108th, and 109th Cavalry Divisions, which were formed in our republic. The legendary 8th Guards Rifle Division named for General Panfilov is the greatest pride of two fraternal republics—Kirghizia and Kazakhstan; it came into being in our region and covered

itself in glory in the fighting outside Moscow and in liberating the Baltic republics from the fascists...

Could Kirghizia, for instance, have remained on the sidelines of the fight against the fascists when the enemy was already trampling the soil of the Ukraine and Belorussia and had captured Moldavia? At the time no one even hesitated over what to do. Of course people had to defend their home, their motherland, and go to the assistance of the beloved Soviet Army and Navy. Kirghizia too did everything it could to help the front from the first days of the war. Had the situation suddenly been as Mr. (O. Kerou) would have liked, the fate of the Central Asian peoples would have been determined according to Hitler's plans. And now we know that the fascists were intending to turn Central Asia and Kazakhstan into a Germany colony and to turn the peoples into slaves of the Aryan race.

It is appropriate to recall what Hitler once wrote: "...If we educate the Russians, Ukrainians, and Kirghiz, this will subsequently rebound against us. Education enables the more developed of them to study history and assimilate historical experience. And thence to develop political ideas which can only be pernicious to our interests... They cannot be allowed to know any more than the meaning of road signs... There is absolutely no need for mathematics and other such things..."

A monstrous plan. And it was not realized because the entire country joined battle. And the party of communists headed the struggle. It is especially important to stress this in the present situation.

We have many difficulties today. In order to overcome them, we advocate economic autonomy and the further strengthening of Kirghizia within the framework of the Soviet federation, in close unity with the other Soviet republics. I reiterate: Alone we would all have had a hard time during the war, and things will be extremely difficult now too—I am addressing those who want separatism...

[Ladin] Preparations for the 45th anniversary of victory are being completed in the republic, as throughout the country. What awaits war and labor veterans?

[Masaliyev] No matter who says what, Victory Day still remains a wonderful and joyful holiday for the whole Soviet people. On the eve of the glorious date there will be meetings with Heroes of the Soviet Union, war and labor veterans, and servicemen from local garrisons at the republic Communist Party Central Committee and party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms [oblast, city, and rayon committees]. Frontline soldiers will also be feted in labor collectives, educational institutions, and military commissariats. We would like to remind all our compatriots on the eve of Victory Day that the defense of the motherland, the strengthening of its defense capability, and the maintenance of the Armed Forces' prestige are a sacred duty for every USSR citizen. Young men from the Army will take part in the preholiday

events. Delegations from Kirghizia are visiting Turkestan Military District units and subunits. The families of dead frontline soldiers, and also servicemen who honestly performed their duty and died in the line of duty during peacetime will not be forgotten. Great Patriotic War veterans and invalids who still need housing will receive apartments as far as possible during the year of the 45th anniversary of victory. Opportunities for giving specific support to the elderly and invalids are increasing with every passing month. After all, 37 departments providing social and everyday home help and serving 1,200 invalids and war veterans have been organized and are operating actively in the republic. In Frunze, for instance, the construction of a hospital for war invalids and internationalist servicemen is being completed. A model polyclinic for veterans is already in operation. Here are some more figures. Our total spending on sanatorium and resort treatment is R581,000 per year. Last year alone in the republic, war veterans were given 4,830 warrants for treatment in the country's sanatoriums. Organs of Soviet power and party committees, right up to the republic Central Committee, actively engage in all this.

[Ladin] Are there problems?

[Masaliyev] There are lots of them. Veterans, invalids, and elderly people in general are still rather poorly off. We still have few residential homes. For instance, it has not been possible to complete on time the construction of such a home in the capital and a number of cities. These shortcomings are being eliminated. There were difficulties in organizing work on the book of remembrance. It will probably run into nine volumes in our republic. Information about dead servicemen is already being published in the local press—our republican martyrology, as it were.

In the days before the holiday the republic's working people, young people, and garrison servicemen will hold subbotniks and voskresniki [Saturday and Sunday voluntary labor] at the burial sites of frontline soldiers. As is well known, 23 evacuation hospitals operated in Kirghizia during the war years. People cherish the 13 fraternal cemeteries where the soldiers who died of their serious wounds are buried. Wherever the sacred graves are—Frunze or Kzyl-Asker, or the remote mining town of Kok-Yangak—there are always fresh flowers at the foot of the obelisks.

Ministry Halts Nuclear Testing in Kazakhstan

LD0205132690 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1234 GMT 2 May 90

[by Risto Popovski]

[Text] Moscow, May 2 (TANJUG)—The Soviet Defense Ministry recently decided to halt all underground nuclear testing in Northern Kazakhstan's Semipalatinsk region.

The Soviet public sees the suspension as a victory for the movement against nuclear testing in the area - even if only a temporary one. The ministry's decision was primarily motivated by a discovery on the negative effects of underground nuclear tests made by biophysicists from the city of Alma-Ata.

The ominous and alarming results of research over a period of 15 years were published here recently.

Although the Soviet public has not yet been acquainted with all the details, Professor Inyushin, head of the research team, spoke to TANJUG about its findings in a frank and direct manner.

Water, which makes up the bulk of all cellular matter in the human body, "remembers" disturbances and waves caused by an underground nuclear explosion. Successive tremors compound the deformity. The body gradually loses its natural resistance and responds to subsequent stimuli with increasing sensitivity and growing pain.

Independent medical statistics and research corroborate the findings of the Alma-Ata bio-physicists.

A high percentage of people living in the vicinity of the nuclear testing region—41 percent—suffer from various forms of neurosis. The number of people seeking medical aid doubled after every underground nuclear test.

Perhaps the most alarming issue is the fate of children born and living in the region. Professor Inyushin has encouraging news. He says his team followed its discovery of the cellular deformities by looking for a way to eliminate them. A bio-energetic rehabilitation method was perfected as a way to "erase" the cells' acquired negative characteristics.

The effects of the nuclear tests discovered in the population of the Semipalatinsk region are not caused by harmful radiation, which is constantly being controlled there and has always been at levels considered safe, usually lower than those found in highly polluted cities.

The deformities are the result of tremors and vibrations caused by the explosions.

Asked if such effects could appear in the populations of regions near nuclear power plants, Professor Inyushin said that such a possibility did exist, but added that lengthy scientific investigation would be needed to prove it.